F.8
Z8 AB5
57 .5 .2
XXII .336.5.10
LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 31 1928
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SCC
1595
Division
Section

NEW JERSEY
COLLEGE LIBRARY

A REPLY TO THE OBJECTIONS OF *Robert Nelson*, Esq;

And of an

Anonymous Author,

Against Dr *CLARKE*'s Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

Being a COMMENTARY upon *Forty* Select Texts of Scripture.

To which is added,

An ANSWER to the REMARKS *of the Author of*, Some Considerations concerning the Trinity, and the Ways of managing that Controversy.

By *SAMUEL CLARKE*, D. D. Rector of St *James's Westminster*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

London, Printed for *James Knapton*, at the *Crown* in St *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1714.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY 1928

TO

ROBERT NELSON Esq;

SIR,

THE *Remarks* upon my *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, which you published in your *Life of the Right Reverend Bishop Bull*; and the *Letter* which you prefixed to a Book entitled, *The Scripture-Doctrine of the most Holy and Undivided Trinity vindicated from the Misinterpretations of Dr Clarke*; are written with so much Candour and Civility, with so much Fairness and Temper, that they may well become an *Example* to Clergymen and Others, of writing Controversy in such a manner, as that *Truth* may by weighing Arguments on both sides be fully searched after, and our common Christianity suffer nothing in the mean time through want of Meekness and Charity. The *Book itself* also is written with so good a Spirit, and so very different from any that have hitherto appeared, that though I think the Notions it contains are for the most part unin-

WITHDRAWN

telligible, and the Arguments of ſmall force, yet, upon account of the good Spirit wherewith it is written, and the particular recommendation you have been pleaſed to give it, it has a juſt claim to be conſidered with all Fairneſs and Calmneſs.

IN your *Life of the Right Reverend Biſhop Bull*, the principal, and indeed the Only Conſiderable Objection you allege againſt my Book, is; that *almoſt all* my Citations out of that Learned Author *are repreſented in a very different View from That which the Author had certainly in writing thoſe Paſſages; as are alſo the Citations out of the Fathers themſelves, which* Dr Clarke *here met with, and hath accommodated to his own purpoſe, and That frequently without ſo much as the leaſt Notice taken of the Explications and Anſwers given to them by* Biſhop Bull. This Objection, you are ſenſible, I had indeavoured to *prevent*; by *declaring beforehand*, that I cited Modern Authors and Fathers too, not with any intention to ſhow what was *in the whole* the Opinion of thoſe Authors; (for the Queſtion was to be determined by *Scripture* only, and not by *Human Authority*;) but I cited them, only to ſhow what *Important Conceſſions* they were obliged to make; even *ſuch Conceſſions*, as of Neceſſity and in ſtrictneſs

Life of Bull, pag. 322

neſs of Argument inferred *my Concluſion*, whether the Authors themſelves made any ſuch Inference or no. And This you do indeed very juſtly and fairly acknowledge. But ſtill, notwithſtanding this reaſonable Acknowledgment, you continue to allege, that *it is enough to have ſhewn what manner of Judgment we ought to make of* Dr Clarke's *Citations, for they are generally applied much after the ſame Manner and with the ſame Views*; and you call it (in a leſs kind manner than uſual,) *the Doctors Artful Way of citing Authors and Books*, and inſinuate that therefore my Quotations are not much to be depended upon. That ſometimes they *are not* indeed *much to be depended upon, for knowing* (as you ſay) *the Opinion or Judgment of any Writer*; is very true, becauſe they were not brought for That Purpoſe: But then they are *very much to be depended upon* for another and far more material reaſon, *viz.* for knowing *the Truth itſelf of Things*. And in order to *This* End, they are always ſo much *the more* to be *depended upon*, and *the more* to be regarded; as the Author, from whom they are cited, was upon the whole *more different* in his Opinion, from what thoſe particular Citations ſeem to expreſs. For Writers upon controverſial Points, ſeldom make more Conceſſions in favour of any opinion different from their own, than the Weight of Truth and

pag. 332.

pag. 326.

pag. 326.

Reaſon neceſſarily extorts from them. Wherefore in citing and making Uſe of ſuch Conceſſions, there is no other *Artfulneſs*, than that moſt juſtifiable one of drawing Arguments ſtrong and concluſive from ſuch Premiſes, as even an Adverſary is of neceſſity forced to grant. Nor needs it at all to be regarded, that ſome of the Writers, from whom ſuch Citations are taken, do themſelves indeavour ſometimes to draw *Concluſions* very different. For in all Argumentation whatſoever, it is well known that the *Premiſes* only are of any Weight; and that *Concluſions* always ſtand for nothing, except the *Reader* finds himſelf compelled to draw them, as well as the *Writer*. Nevertheleſs, though the *Truth* of the *Scripture-Doctrine* does not at all depend upon it, yet, for the ſatisfaction of ſuch as are apt to pay a greater deference to *Authority* than is reaſonable, I ſhall not omit taking this occaſion to aſſure you, that, as far as I am able to judge from the whole Courſe and Tenour of the Writings of the Antients, All the paſſages cited in *my whole Book* from the following Principal Writers, *viz. Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius*, *Juſtin*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Novatian* and *Euſebius*, are not only particular Conceſſions, but do expreſs what ſeems moreover to have been in the whole the *real Sentiments* of the reſpective Writers themſelves: And in the *Firſt*

Part

Part of *my Book*, the Passages cited out of *Other* both *Antient* and *Later* Writers concerning *particular Texts*, whatever different Opinions the same Authors perhaps elsewhere contend for, yet seem always to express their *real* Sentiments, what was in Their Days understood to be the meaning of *those particular Texts*.

Your next Objection is as follows: *Dr* Clarke *asserts expressly, that the Scripture, when it mentions* God *absolutely and by way of Eminence, means the Person of the* Father; *as likewise when it mentioneth the* One God, *or the* Only God: *though he could not, after having read the* Defense of the Nicene Faith, *be ignorant that this was contrary to the Mind of the Catholick Fathers.* Now, how contrary soever This Assertion had indeed been to the Mind of the *Catholick Fathers*, or of *Any other Writers whatsoever*; yet it would nevertheless have been *most necessarily*, and *most evidently True*; because it is a Matter of Fact, that shows itself in full Light to every Mans own Eyes at the first Sight; there appearing, in my Collection, *Chap.* 1, *Sect.* 1 *and* 2, more than 300 *Texts*, wherein either the word [*GOD*] absolutely, or the title [*One God*,] is, in the express words of the Text itself, put in *contradistinction*, not to the *Creature*, or *False Gods*, but to *pag.* 325.

either *the Son*, or *the Spirit of God*, or *Both*. And This, the Author himſelf of *the Defenſe of the Nicene Faith*, who (you expected) ſhould have convinced me of the contrary, does moſt expreſsly acknowledge. *That the* Father *of Jeſus Chriſt* (ſays he) *is* Alone *the* One True God; *if it be underſtood of That Prehemi-nence of* the Father, *by which He* Alone *is* of Himſelf [*by Self-exiſtence*] the True God; *we confeſs that This Aſſertion is moſt true.* And again: *We readily grant, that for this Cauſe the* Father [*the Father Alone*, ſo he expreſſes it in the beginning of the very ſame Sentence,] *is moſt uſually ſtiled properly* [or *peculiarly*] the True God, *both in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Writings of the Antients*; *eſpecially where the Divine Perſons are mentioned Together.* And again: *The Ante-Nicene Writers commonly call* God the Father, *by way of diſtinction, ſometimes* GOD *abſolutely, ſometimes* The One God, *ſometimes* The God and Father of All, (*according to the Texts*, 1 Cor. 8, 4; Eph. 4, 6;

Patrem ſolum Jeſu Chriſti eſſe *Unum illum Verum Deum*; ſi de *Patris* prærogativâ, quâ ipſe *Solus à Seipſo Deus Verus* eſt, intelligatur; veriſſimum eſſe illud fatemur. *Bulli Defenſ. Proœm.* §. 4.

Atque eâdem de causâ appellationem *Veri Dei*, PATRI ſæpiùs tum in Sacris Literis, tum in Veterum Scriptis, præſertim quoties Diviæ Perſonæ ſimul nominantur, propriè tribui. *Defenſ. Sect.* 2. *cap.* 3, §. 10.

Scriptoribus Ante-Nicænis ſolenne eſt, *Deum Patrem διακεκριμένως* appellare nunc *Deum* abſolutè, nunc *Unum illum Deum*, nunc *Deum & Patrem omnium*, (juxta Scripturas, 1 *Cor.* 8, 4; *Eph.* 4, 6; *Joh.* 17, 3;) quia ſcilicet *Solus Pater a ſe Deus eſt*, filius autem Deus de Deo. *Defenſ. Sect.* 4, *cap.* 1, § 2.

6; Joh. 17, 3;) *Namely, because* the Father Alone *is* God of Himself, [*by Self-existence*;] *but the Son, is only God of God.* This is very plainly the Doctrine of *Scripture*, whatever had been the Opinion of the *Catholick Fathers*. But neither, in Truth, is This Assertion at all *contrary* (as you conceive it to be) *to the Mind of the Catholick Fathers*; much less, from the *Defense of the Nicene Faith* doth it appear (as you suppose,) to be *contrary to the Mind of those Fathers*. For however the Fathers *after* the Council of *Nice* express themselves at other times, and whatever opinions they profess; yet in *This* Point, even *They*, (as well as the *Antienter* Writers who spake more uniformly,) generally confirm my Assertion in the fullest and clearest Terms that are possible to be used. As you may find in above 50 passages cited in my *Second Part*, §. 9 *and* 11; And as the Author himself of *the Defense of the Nicene Faith* fully acknowledges, both in the Place I just now cited, and in many other passages: As, where he says that *the Antients, because the* Father *is the Origin, Cause, Author and Fountain of the Son*; *made no Scruple to call Him* The One *and* Only God; *For thus even the* Nicene *Fathers themselves be-*

Veteres *Deum Patrem*, eò quòd Principium, Causa, Auctor, & Fons Filii sit, *Unum illum & Solum Deum* appellare non sunt veriti. Sic enim ipsi Patres *Nicæni* exordiuntur suum Symbolum; Credimus in *Unum Deum, Patrem Omnipotentem.* Defens. Sect 4, cap 1, §. 6.

gin

gin their Creed; I believe in One God, the Father Almighty, *&c.* And again; that even the Fathers *after* the Council of Nice, *make no scruple to stile the* Father *the Origin, the Cause, the Author of the Son*; *nay to call the* Father *therefore* The One God. The Evidence of This whole matter is so exceedingly clear, that there is no possibility of evading it otherwise, than by supposing (as your * *Anonymous Friend* does upon the Authority of *Tertullian*,) that the *Son* is included in the word [*Father*,] as well as in the word [*God*;] and that, when in our Prayers we say *Our Father*, we by those words make application to the *Son*, as well as to *the Father*: Than which, nothing (I think) can be more *unintelligible*, or can introduce a greater *Confusion* into our most solemn Acts of Divine Worship.

Illi igitur intrepidè quoq; *Patrem* dicunt Principium, Causam, Auctorem Filii; ipsumq; adeò Patrem, *Unum illum Deum* appellant. *ibid.* §. 3.

* *Pag.* 36.

Pag. 325. But you add: *There is a whole Chapter in* Irenæus, [lib. 3, cap. 6,] *purposely to shew, that Christ is in Scripture expressly and absolutely called* God; *and that he is* the One *and* Only God *in the Unity of the Father's Substance or Essence*; *and* Very God, *in opposition to all those that are improperly called* God *in the sacred Writings*. A Reader, that pleases to look into *Irenæus*, will

will very much wonder at your citing this Chapter of his; which, inſtead of containing what *You* think you find there, does on the contrary very clearly and fully expreſs the doctrine in the ſame manner as *I* have done; inſomuch that there are Few more remarkable Teſtimonies in all Antiquity, of the opinion of the Primitive Church in this whole matter. It is a large Chapter; and the Deſign of it throughout, is to explain how Chriſt is *truly God* and *Lord*, and yet that at the ſame time the *Father* is ſtrictly and emphatically the *One* and *Only God*. The *whole Chapter* is worth every learned perſons peruſal: But the *Sum* of it, is This. When the Scripture ſpeaks of *Falſe Gods*, it always does it, ſays he [*cum aliquo additamento & ſignificatione, per quam oſtenduntur non eſſe dii,*] with the *Addition* of ſome word which ſhows them to be indeed *No Gods*; as when it calls them the *Gods of the Gentiles*, or the like: But whenever it uſes the word [*God* or *Lord*] abſolutely, and without any ſuch additional explication; then (ſays he) it always means a perſon who is *truly and really God* or *Lord*; That is to ſay, either *God the Father* [qui dominatur omnium] *who ruleth over All*, or the *Son* [qui dominium ACCEPIT a Patre ſuo omnis conditionis] *who RECIEVED from his Father dominion over the whole Creation:*

According

According to the following Texts *(says he,)* Pſ. 110, 1, *Set thou on my right hand, till I make thine Enemies thy footſtool*; And Gen. 19, 24, *The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah Fire and Brimſtone from the Lord*; that is, the *Son*, ſaith he, [not in his humane Nature, but in his State before his Incarnation,] *RECIEVED Power from his Father to judge the Sodomites*, [a Patre ACCEPISSE poteſtatem ad judicandum Sodomitas,] *for their wickedneſs:* And Heb. 1; 8, 9, *Thy Throne, O † GOD, is for ever and ever, —— thou haſt loved righteouſneſs, —— therefore GOD, even THY GOD* [the *GOD* of Him who is himſelf ſtiled *God* in the foregoing verſe] *hath anointed thee*: Here (ſays he) the Spirit gives the Name *God*, both to the *Son* who was anointed, and to the *Father* who anointed him. The Argument therefore of *Irenæus*, is plainly This: The *Gods of the Heathen* are *Falſe Gods*, or *no Gods at all: God the Father* is *True God or Lord*, becauſe he originally *Ruleth over All:* The *Son* alſo is *True God or Lord*, becauſe he has *Truly and Really RECIEVED from his Father Divine Power and Dominion over the whole Creation.* But ſtill the *Father Alone*

† The Reverend Dr *Wells* contends, that the word, *God*, [אֱלֹהִים] in this firſt part of the Text, means *the Father* as well as *the Son*. *Letter to Dr* Clarke, *pag.* 4. What! Is the Throne of *God the Father* therefore *for ever and ever*, becauſe *God, even His God*, anointed him, *&c.?* This would have been thought very ſtrange, in the Primitive Times.

Alone is ſtrictly and properly *the One and Only God.* For ſo he concludes his whole Argument: *I pray to Thee, O Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob, the FATHER of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; —— *who haſt made Heaven and Earth, and Ruleſt over All*; *who art* [Solus & Verus Deus] *the ONLY and the True God, above whom there is no other God: Who* [* præter dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum, dominatione quoq; dominaris Spiritus Sancti,] *beſides* [*that thou governeſt by*] *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, ruleſt alſo by the Dominion of the Holy Spirit: Grant that every one that readeth this my Book, may* [cognoſcere Te, quia Solus Deus es] *know Thee to be the ONLY God, &c.* And he alleges finally That Text of *St. Paul*, 1 Cor. 1, 4, *We know that an Idol is nothing in the world, and that there is None other God but One*; *For though there be that are Called*

* Theſe words are obſcure, and ſeem not to have been well underſtood by the Latin Tranſlator, and are perhaps corrupt: But however they be underſtood, they plainly refer to the Supremacy of the *Father*, with regard both to the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*. The later Editions of *Irenæus* read this paſſage, *per dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum, dominationem* [or *donationem*] *quoq; dona Spiritus Sancti.* But this, though it makes Senſe in it ſelf, yet does not at all ſuit the connexion of the Authors Whole Diſcourſe; Neither does the word *quoq;* come in at all better with the Benedictines *dominationem*, than with Dr Grabes *donationem.* The old Editions, though corrupt, yet in all probability retain ſomething that is nearer to the Authors true meaning.

Gods,

Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth; yet to Us there is but One God, The Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and One Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are All things, and we by Him. You could not have picked a Chapter out of the whole works of *Irenæus*, or indeed out of all Antiquity, more *contrary* to *your own* purpose, or more *pertinent* to *mine*.

But however This might be, CERTAIN
pag. 326. *it is*, you say, *that* Dr Clarke, *who had so ample a Collection of Testimonies concerning the Trinity before him in this Treatise* [*of Bp.* Bulls,] *as well as in* Petavius; *hath not made That Use of them, which this indefatigable and judicious Collector* [Bp. Bull] *did*; *or which might have been expected from a Person of so great a Character in the Church and learned world, as* Dr Clarke. That I did not make the *Same Use* of my *Collections*, that is, did not draw from them the *same Conclusions*, which some very learned and judicious Men had formerly done; is indeed *CERTAIN*, but *no part of the Question* between us. But, that I did not make *That Use* of them, which might reasonably have been *expected* from the Character you are pleased with great Civility to bestow upon me; this, *it might have been expected a Person of so great a Character in the learned world as Mr* Nelson,

ſon, ſhould not have *Concluded*, but have left to the *Reader* to *judge* whether it *followed* from his Premiſes or not.

The Liſt you have drawn up of the Paſſages cited by me out of the learned *Bp. Bull*, and ranked in Columns referring both to *His* book and *Mine*, that the Reader may at leiſure compare and conſider them; is a very fair and reaſonable Method of ſetting that matter in a true Light. There are in this Liſt of yours, Thirty-eight Paſſages, from which *you leave the learned to judge* what Concluſion rightly follows: And ſo *I alſo* am willing to leave them. Only, ſince you have thought fit, as a Specimen, to make ſome ſhort Remarks upon the firſt Four of them; you will give me leave briefly to conſider thoſe Remarks. *pag.* 328. *pag.* 332.

The firſt Paſſage, you ſay, *is a Remark of Bp.* Bull, *upon* certain *words of* Origen, wherein the *Bp.* has *ſhown* (againſt *Huetius*) that *Origen ſpake of Chriſt as an Exemplar in his Humane Nature*, and not *with reſpect to his Divine Nature: And not the leaſt word is ſaid, that can juſtly be interpreted of the Son's Inferiority to the Father in Nature, but rather the contrary: For he there ſheweth, by clear and undoubted Teſtimonies taken from the Book againſt* Celſus, *that* Origen *did hold and teach the Son to be* very God, Uncreated, Immortal, Immutable, *pag.* 329.

ble, &c. I have abridged your *words*, but I am perſwaded your Candour will not complain that I have in the leaſt altered your *Senſe*. Now in every part of this Reaſoning of yours, there is (I think) ſomething defective. For how many *Other Attributes and Perfections* ſoever, *Origen* in his Book aſcribes to the *Son*; yet unleſs he aſcribed *Supremacy* alſo, (which he no where does, but on the contrary every where expreſsly and with great caution excludes it,) this cannot at all affect the Queſtion: *See my Scripture-doctrine, pag.* 359 *and* 266. And though he *had* indeed in *Other clear and undoubted paſſages* (which yet he no where *has*) aſſerted the *Son* to be *Supreme* as well as the *Father*; yet it would not at all follow (unleſs *Origen* were a Writer infallibly conſiſtent with himſelf,) that he did not interpret the *particular text* referred to, in the manner that I affirmed him to interpret it. And though Bp. *Bull* does indeed indeavour to ſhow, that *Origen* in the place here referred to, ſpeaks of Chriſt as an Exemplar in his *humane* Nature; yet he expreſsly acknowledges [*ſi daremus* Origenem *ibi loqui de Chriſto quatenùs Deus eſt,——haud minùs rectè eâ ratione Patri primas tribuere potuit,*] that *if it be granted that* Origen *there ſpeaks concerning Chriſt as God, yet——as deriving —from the Fountain of the Father, he might rightly,*

See my *Scripture-doctrine, p.* 51.

rightly, even in this ſenſe, yield the preheminence to the Father : Which acknowledgment is all that I cited him for ; and therefore it ought not to be ſuggeſted that I had cited him unfairly. As to the diſtinction you allege, that here is *not the leaſt Word ſaid, that can juſtly be interpreted of the Son's Inferiority to the Father in NATURE, but rather the contrary :* I ſhall not contend with you about metaphyſical *Words*, which ſince *I* have conſtantly *avoided* becauſe of their Abſtract and Ambiguous Signification, *you* ſhould not have choſen to uſe them in repreſenting my Senſe. Biſhop *Bull* expreſsly owns the *Perſon of the Son* to be, in his Higheſt Capacity, *ſubordinate to the Perſon of the Father :* Which is a Notion very *intelligible*, (whatever be the Nature, Subſtance or Eſſence of either ;) and is all (I think) that the Honour of God and the Whole Doctrine of Scripture obliges us to contend for. The Word, *Nature*, (as it ſignifies the Nature of any Perſon, abſtract from the Perſon himſelf,) is a Metaphyſical Term, of great Ambiguity and Obſcureneſs, and of no Uſe that I know of in any Queſtion, but to introduce more Difficulties by *dark Expreſſions*, than are really found in the *Things themſelves*.

The next Paſſage, you ſay, *cited by Dr* Clarke, is *no more for an Inferiority of* Nature *in the Son, than the firſt is ; the plain Mean-* Pag. 330.

ing of it being, that——Christ appearing to the Holy Men under the Old Testament, received from them divine Honours, and was manifested to them by the most High Name of God. Mr Bull *first proveth &c. — And there is nothing in this whole Method, nor in any particular Argument under it, which doth tend in the least to favour such an Inequality of NATURE in Father and Son, as is included in That Scheme which it is brought to support.* The passage here referred to, are those words of the learned Bp. *Bull*, wherein he declares and approves the opinion of the Antient Fathers, that the *Angel of the Lord* (Acts 7, 30,) which appeared to *Moses* in the Bush, and said, *I am the God of thy Fathers*, was the *Son* appearing in his *Fathers Name.* Now since the Scripture every where represents the *Father*, as absolutely *Invisible*; and those Antient Writers, whose Opinions Bp *Bull* cites and approves, always suppose it impious to imagine that *the Supreme God and Father of All* ever appeared visibly *in his own Person*; the Inference I designed should be drawn from hence, is, that the *Person of the Son* is *Subordinate* to the *Person of the Father*, whose *Angel or Messenger* he is, and in whose *Name* and by whose *Mission* he appears. All this, the learned Bp. makes no scruple to grant; and therefore 'twas no misrepresentation of his words, to cite them

See my *Scripture-doctrine*, *pag.* 117.

them as granting it. Concerning the Metaphyſical and obſcure Notion of *NATURE* indeed; as the Scripture * no where mentions it, ſo neither have *I* any where drawn any conſequence at all concerning it. And what Notion the learned Biſhop had of that matter, was not my buſineſs to inquire; ſince my Scheme was entire, without entring into that metaphyſical part; and, whatever was his Notion in *other* reſpects, yet That which I cited him as granting, he did expreſsly intend to grant.

* See below, the Note on *Gal.* 4, 8.

The Third paſſage, you ſay, *is certainly no better applied, than the former; the Deſign of that whole Chapter from whence it is taken, being to anſwer a principal Objection, which had even ſhocked Mr* Bull *himſelf for a good while, that would infer a Difference in the divine nature of the Son from that of the Father, the one Manifeſtable, the other Not manifeſtable.* To which I anſwer as before: whatever was the Deſign of the whole Chapter, yet the Paſſage *cited* by me is neither miſrepreſented nor miſapplied, becauſe the Author in That paſſage expreſsly intended to grant, what I cited him as granting.

pag. 331.

See my *Scripture-doctrine*, *pag.* 118.

The Fourth paſſage, [which is as follows; *Quod Origenes in loco citato dicit, Filium etiam quà Deus eſt, hoc eſt, Deus ex Deo, Patre minorem eſſe*; —— *planè Catholicum eſſe, atq; etiam a Patribus, qui poſt*

Nicænum Concilium Arianam hæresin acerrimè impugnârunt, defensum —— ostendemus. *i. e.* " What *Origen* affirms in the place " before-cited, *viz.* that the Son, even as " he is God, (that is, God of God,) is " Less than the Father; —— this we " shall show to be very Catholick, and " maintained even by the Fathers *After* " the Council of *Nice*, who most strongly " opposed the Arian Heresy ". *Bp. Bulls Defense of the Nicene Faith, Sect.* 2, *chap.* 9, § 12.] This *Fourth passage*, you say, *seemeth indeed to be very much to the Purpose; and every one that reads it as it is cited, and will not be at the pains to consult either what follows it, or what is there distinctly referred to, may be easily led to think, that our Author* [Bp. Bull] *was not a Defender, but an Underminer of the Nicene Faith, by maintaining the Son, even AS HE IS GOD, to be LESS than the Father: Which though it be most true in a certain sense which He hath explained, in conformity to Primitive Testimonies, and to the Confession of the Council of Nice itself, as He is* God of God; *yet is both diametrically opposite to his plain Meaning, and to what he defended for the Catholick Faith with so much strength, if thereby it be understood that there is Greater and Less in the divine Nature and Essence.* What the meaning is of *Greater* and *Less* in *Abstract* metaphysical

Pag 331

metaphyſical *Notions*, which have no real Exiſtence, ſuch as are *Nature* and *Eſſence*, I confeſs I underſtand not. But that the *Son*, the Intelligent Agent or Perſon himſelf, is in his Higheſt Capacity *Subordinate* to the Perſon of the *Father*; this the learned Biſhop does, in the paſſage now cited, moſt expreſsly grant; and nothing that he has ſaid concerning the *obſcurer* Notions of *Nature* and *Eſſence*, in the Other parts of his Book to which both You and the Author himſelf refers us, does in any wiſe revoke ſo *plain and intelligible* a Conceſſion.

See my *Scripture-doctrine*, pag. 161.

All the reſt of the paſſages which I cited out of this Learned Writer, *you* leave to the Judgment of the Reader, without making any further Remarks upon them: And *I alſo* am willing there to leave them: Being fully perſwaded, that any careful and intelligent Reader, who ſhall give himſelf the Trouble to compare them, will find I have nowhere miſrepreſented the Senſe of the Author: All the Citations being ſo many plain Conceſſions, which he *really intended* to make in the manner I have repreſented them; though *he* did not indeed always draw ſuch Inferences from them, as *I* think follow by juſt and neceſſary Argumentation. And the like is to be underſtood of my Citations out of the *Later Fathers*, and out of ſuch *other Writers*, as were not of the ſame opinion with

me in the whole of this Controverſy. In which it is ſtill always to be remembred, that not the uncertain Opinions of fallible Men, but the Authority of inſpired Scripture only, is the Rule by which our Judgment muſt finally be determined.

IN your *Letter* prefixed to the Book entitled, *The Scripture-doctrine of the moſt holy and undivided Trinity*; Your deſiring
pag. 7. that *this whole matter may be ſifted into according as it deſerves, and the Evidence of Truth may determine it for the ſtrongeſt ſide*:
pag. 14. Your fairly acknowledging, that *to the Goſpel and to the Teſtimony the Appeal is made, and there let it be determined*; and that *All muſt commend the Deſign of tracing the Originals of our moſt holy Faith with Candour and Impartiality, and of moſt ſtrictly cleaving to the ſincere Revelation of Divine Truth*:
pag. 20. Your profeſſing, that *if we would avoid running into Hereſy and Errour, we are obliged to have recourſe to the* Rule *itſelf, and alſo to take in the beſt Helps for the under-*
pag. 22. *ſtanding this Rule*: Your *fully agreeing, that this Matter ought to be examined thoroughly on all ſides, by a ſerious Study of the whole Scripture, and by taking care that the Explication be conſiſtent with itſelf*

in

in every part: Your candidly allowing, that *certainly the Deſign of digeſting with care and pains under proper heads the Texts of Scripture which relate to this Doctrine, is very commendable*; *and then drawing up a Scheme of the Whole, and reducing and explaining it, in a great number of particular and diſtinct Propoſitions:* Your declaring, that *there is no ſufficient Reaſon in* your *Opinion, for any Learned Perſon who may think* me *miſtaken, to treat* me *angrily and in the Spirit of Popery*; *as if we were not to uſe our own Underſtandings in Matters of Religion, as well as in other Matters*; *but muſt always plead for what Notions happen at any time to prevail, as if they were Therefore true becauſe they prevail:* And your *wiſhing that the Spirit of Meekneſs and Chriſtianity did more univerſally influence the Management of all our Diſputes both Religious and Civil:* In all theſe Inſtances, Your *Fairneſs and Juſtice* can never ſufficiently be commended; And the *Perſonal Eſteem* you are pleaſed to expreſs for *Me*, is more than perhaps will by ſome be thought excuſable. Nevertheleſs, ſince in the other parts of your Letter, though the Whole be indeed written with an excellent Spirit, yet there are ſome particulars wherein I cannot but differ from you in opinion; I know you will not be diſpleaſed

pag. 22.

pag. 23.

pag. 26.

pag. 15.

nor take it at all amiſs, if I freely communicate my Thoughts to you thereupon.

In the firſt place, the mention you make of *drawing in Authors and Authorities to ſpeak that which we are certain enough they could never mean*, ſeems to refer to the Objection you had before made, in the *Life of Biſhop Bull*, concerning my manner of quoting Him and other Writers. To which Objection I have already anſwered at large above; *viz.* that ſuch *Conceſſions*, as any Writer is by the Weight of Truth obliged and does expreſsly *mean to grant*, however he may *not* perhaps *mean* to draw the ſame *Inferences* from them as I do; ſuch *Conceſſions*, far from being *unfair Citations*, are of all others the *moſt pertinent Teſtimonies* that can be alleged in favour of any Aſſertion whatſoever.

pag. 5.

See above, pag. 4.

The *Commendation* you give the Author whoſe Book you publiſh, *viz.* that *he has applied the Rules of Criticiſm not* Againſt *but* For *the Faith, of which the Catholick Church is in Poſſeſſion*; ſeems not altogether agreeable to that exact *Impartiality*, which you expreſs in many other parts of your Letter. For the thing you here commend him for, is his contending for an Opinion, upon account of its being (or being vulgarly ſuppoſed to be) a *Common* one. (Which Argument,

pag. 9.

Argument, you well know, holds equally in *All Religions*, and particularly in that of the Church of *Rome* with the greateſt Advantage, who allow None to be Members of the *Catholick Church* but Themſelves.) Whereas a good Writer ought not to intend beforehand to apply the Rules of Criticiſm *for* or *againſt* any thing; but to find, by uſing the right Rules of Criticiſm in underſtanding the Scripture, what Doctrine is true or falſe, and conſequently what opinions he ought to declare *for* or *againſt*. How far I myſelf obſerved this Rule, the candid Reader will judge, by obſerving that I not only omitted none of the Texts which Others had alleged, but moreover mentioned ſome Texts ſeemingly againſt me, (ſuch as *Luke* 1; 16, 17; See *Scripture-doctrine*, *pag.* 84;) which I could not find that the Writers on the other ſide of the queſtion had taken any notice of for Themſelves.

There are, (you ſay, *p.* 9,) *about Forty Texts, upon which the main ſtreſs of* Dr Clarke's *Theory depends, that are here examined.* What Advantage your learned Friend can make of theſe *Forty* Texts, will appear in the Sequel. But had he been able to prove ever ſo ſtrongly, that the Truth of my Theory did not at all follow from theſe *Forty Texts*; yet it would have availed

availed him nothing. For I alleged, beſides theſe, above 300 *other* Texts, of which he takes not the leaſt Notice, in which All that I contend for is as clearly expreſſed, as any thing can be expreſſed in words.

What you allege (*pag.* 19,) concerning *the Wounds which Dr* Clarke's *Book may have given his Mother the Church, (which has been ſo Kind to him,* pag. 9;) is alſo what I cannot perfectly reconcile with the other parts of your Letter. The *Kindneſs* which has been ſhown to me both in other reſpects, and in That likewiſe which I gueſs you had in your Thoughts, I acknowledge moſt readily with all gratefulneſs: And God forbid that I ſhould ever, ſo much as by Accident, much leſs by Deſign, give any *Wound* to the Church: For *Wo be to him, by whom* (even though it be but through *Careleſsneſs* only,) any *Offence cometh.* But ſince *you* with all fairneſs acknowledge, and the *Church itſelf* conſtantly declares, that *to the Goſpel and to the Teſtimony the Appeal muſt* always *be made*; that is, that the *Scripture* is the *only Rule of Truth in Matters of Revelation*; I cannot imagine upon what ground you can ſuppoſe a careful Examination into the Whole Doctrine of Scripture, made with Sobriety and Serioufneſs, with Modeſty and all poſſible

pag. 14.

ſible Decency, is *giving Wounds to the Church.* On the contrary, it ſeems to Me one of the greateſt poſſible Expreſſions of *true Zeal and Concern* for *That Church*, which is to be *glorious, not having ſpot or wrinkle or any ſuch thing, but holy and without blemiſh*; and one of the Beſt Methods, if not the Only effectual one, of *healing*, rather than *inlarging*, the Wounds of the *viſible Church*; that every one contribute, as much as in him lies, towards making the *Scriptures of God*, in reality and in Effect, as well as in Profeſſion, the *only Standard of Faith and Practiſe*; and that all Opinions, and Explications of opinions, be Perpetually compared with and tried by That unconteſted Rule. To which purpoſe *you yourſelf* have excellently diſcourſed, in ſome parts of *Biſhop Bull's Life.*

You will give me leave from a Paſſage which I meet with in *your Letter* a little lower, to obſerve how ſtrange and unaccountable an Influence the Uſe of Metaphyſical and Scholaſtick Terms ſometimes has upon the Underſtandings even of Wiſe and Good Men. *The Divine Oeconomy of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, IN THE UNITY OF THE DIVINE ESSENCE, is taught us*, you ſay, *by our excellent Church in her moſt publick and authentick Acts, and is the Common Faith both* *pag.* 24.

of

of Proteſtants and Papiſts, or the Common Salvation as delivered in all the Churches Reformed and Unreformed. A Notion expreſſed with ſuch Solemnity as This, is what an ignorant and unprejudiced perſon, hearing it thus delivered, would immediately expect to find in every page of his Bible, and of all Antient Chriſtian Authors, and in every part of the Forms now uſed in the Church: Whereas, in Truth, both the word [*Eſſence*] itſelf, and the Phraſe [*in the Unity of the Divine Eſſence,*] are merely Scholaſtick and Metaphyſical Terms, of very uncertain Signification, (as any one will find, when he indeavours to declare what he *means* by them;) not *Once* found in the whole New Teſtament, nor in the Orthodox Fathers of the Firſt Ages, nor in any part of the Articles or Liturgy of the Church of *England*, which are its *moſt publick and authentick Acts*. Now of What Uſe can the introducing ſuch new Terms be? For either they have no determinate Signification at all: Or elſe they are intended to expreſs the ſame Doctrine, which is taught in Scripture; And then, why could not That Doctrine have been as well and better expreſt by you in thoſe ſame words, which the Wiſdom of God thought moſt proper to expreſs it in? Or elſe, laſtly, they expreſs ſomething different from what is taught in Scripture; and then

then they are very bad and dangerous expressions indeed. Concerning *This matter also*, you *yourself* have discoursed most excellently, in your *Life of Bishop Bull*; and shown with all Strength and Clearness the mischief of such *Scholastick and Systematical* Terms, in the passages referred to in the Conclusion of *my Letter to Dr Wells*.

In the passage next following in your Letter, I cannot but observe, that by your *changing your Expression* in one and the same Sentence, you insensibly drop the whole *Force of the Argument* you intended to make use of. For when you say, many Learned and Good Men apprehend me, *Not to have represented the True Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity, but to have substituted in its room another of* my *own, Against*—— (*Against the True Scripture-doctrine*, your Argument required you to say; But instead of That, you only say) *Against the True Apostolical* TRADITION *of that Doctrine, and the* COMMON INTERPRETATION *of the Scriptures throughout all the Ages of the Church of Christ.* Now, against *Tradition*, and against *common Interpretation*, is against *no body can tell what.* For, other *Apostolical Tradition*, than what is delivered in Scripture, there is None to be found that can at all be depended upon; and *common Interpretation* signifies pag. 25.

ſignifies as many different Doctrines, as there are or ever have been different Churches in the World. As I have ſhown at large in my Letter to Dr *Wells*.

The Excuſe, which you (who know well how to write with the greateſt Temper *yourſelf*) are willing to make for *Others* who write *without That Spirit of Meekneſs and Chriſtianity*, is a very *charitable* one; *viz.* that they think they obey the *Apoſtolical Injunction* of *Contending Earneſtly for the Faith*. But This, though it will indeed excuſe *much Zeal*, yet it will not excuſe *Wrath and Uncharitableneſs*. For, *the Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteouſneſs of God*. And, as far as I have been able to obſerve, thoſe perſons have always been in proportion *moſt hot and angry*, whoſe Doctrine has been *leaſt agreeable to Scripture*, and who have been much leſs concerned for the *Doctrine delivered TO*, than for That which (as you well obſerve, *pag.* 24,) was *delivered BY the Saints*, that is, by thoſe Writers whoſe opinions they happened moſt to like.

pag. 24, 25, 26.

But the moſt important Objection in your whole Letter, is That which follows. *Too many*, you ſay, *think themſelves able to overturn Any Foundations whatſoever, if ſuch a Method, as* Dr Clarke *propoſes, be allowable,*

pag. 15.

allowable, with reſpect to the moſt ſolemn Acts and Deeds of That Church and Community whereof we are Members, and to ſubſtitute what they pleaſe in their Room : That *from a Method of This Nature, we are threatned with the overturning of Foundations both Sacred and CIVIL :* That *if the Judges and Others learned in the Law, ſhall follow the ſame Method of interpreting the Laws of the Land, and accommodating the CIVIL Oaths and Engagements, as* Dr Clarke *has taken in interpreting and accommodating the Senſe of the CHURCH, in her moſt authentick Forms and Declarations before God and Man, and of the Venerable Fathers of the Catholick Church ; there are Many of the Opinion, that every thing might be eaſily leaped over, and that no Eſtabliſhment could be ſo ſtrong as to laſt long :* And, *Who knows whereabouts his Religion, Liberty, or Property may be, if ſuch a Latitude of Interpretation be defenſible ?* I am ſure I have repreſented this Objection of yours, in its full force. The Reader will obſerve, that 'tis an Objection *ad hominem* only, and nothing at all to the Merits of any queſtion concerning the *Truth* or *Erroneouſneſs* of any *Opinion* or *Doctrine*. Nevertheleſs, becauſe 'tis indeed a very Important Objection *ad hominem*, I will indeavour to explain myſelf very diſtinctly to you upon it. With reſpect to *Civil* matters,

pag. 19.
pag. 21.
pag. 22.

matters, which are in their own Nature *indifferent*, there is lodged in every Government a *Legiſlative Power*, which makes what Laws it thinks fit, and may, in things which are the proper Subject of Civil Authority, either eſtabliſh *one thing* by Law, or *another thing* quite different from it: And the Subject ſhall equally be bound in *either* Caſe, becauſe in ſuch Inſtances no *Superiour Authority* hath required him to act otherwiſe: Nor can there, in this Caſe, be any other *Rule*, by which to interpret the Law; but only by diſcovering, from the obvious Signification of the words, what was in the Whole the *Real Senſe and Intent of the Legiſlators*. But now in *Eccleſiaſtical* matters, (excepting *Rites and Ceremonies*, which are of a *Civil* nature,) the Caſe is very different. The *Church*, in matters of *Doctrine*, has *no Legiſlative Power:* The *Proteſtant Church* pretends to no
Article 20. ſuch Power; but only to be *a Witneſs and a Keeper of Holy Writ*. Chriſt and his Apoſtles have delivered and unalterably eſtabliſhed That whole Doctrine, which is to be, in Matters of Revelation, the *Rule of our Faith:* And *to* this Rule no humane Power can *add* any thing, nor *diminiſh from* it: For he that *preacheth any Other Goſpel*, is *accurſed*, Gal. 1, 9. Particular Churches require Mens *Aſſent to*, and *Uſe of*, certain *forms* of words; not as the *Rule of their Faith*,

Faith, but as *prudential Means of Uniformity*, and of *preventing Diſorder and Confuſion* among themſelves. And when in ſuch Forms there be (as there generally are) Expreſſions which at firſt ſight look different ways, (as I have ſhown there are *more* Expreſſions in the Liturgy of the Church of *England* expreſsly *for* me in the preſent Controverſy, than there are which ſeem to be *againſt* me;) it cannot be, but Men muſt be allowed to interpret what is *obſcure*, by that which ſeems to them more *plain and ſcriptural*. Every Man that (for the ſake of Peace and Order) *aſſents to*, or *makes uſe of*, any ſuch Forms of Humane Appointment; is obliged to *reconcile* them with what appears to Him to be the Doctrine of Scripture, and take care to underſtand them in ſuch a Senſe only, as is *conſiſtent* with That Doctrine: Otherwiſe he parts with his *Chriſtianity*, for the ſake of a *Civil and political Religion*. It becomes a ſincere Man, (eſpecially if he varies from Notions commonly received,) to *Declare plainly* in what Senſe he underſtands any words of humane Inſtitution; that his *Inferiours* and *Equals* may not be impoſed upon by him, and that his *Superiours* may judge of ſuch *Declaration*. That the *Senſe in which any Human Forms appear to a Mans ſelf to be conſiſtent with Scripture*, and not the *preſumed Meaning of the Com-*

pilers, is to be the Rule and Measure of his understanding them; is both *evident in Reason*, (because otherwise every Humane Goverment makes a *new Rule of Faith*,) and is moreover *by All Protestants agreed upon without controversy in Practise*. For, the Article in the *Apostles Creed* concerning *Christs Descent into Hell*, is now universally understood in a Sense probably different from what the *Composers* of the Creed intended. And the *damnatory Clauses in the Athanasian Creed*, are now by very Few understood in that Sense, which in all probability the *Compiler* of it in that very dark and ignorant Age designed to express. And the *Procession of the Holy Ghost*, set forth in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds in *one* Sense; (not to mention Bp. *Pearson*'s apologizing for the *Greek* Church,) is by Mr *Bennet* in his Explication of his own Sense concerning that point, shown to be *Now* understood by Many (without any Suspicion of Insincerity) in a *different* Sense. And the Doctrines of *Predestination and Original Sin*, are at this day by all eminent Divines (after the example of Arch-Bishop *Laud*, and of the Learned Bishop *Bull*, whom you yourself have excellently vindicated,) understood in a Sense, which there is no appearance the Composers of the XXXIX Articles meant to teach; and which, there is all appearance the Compo-

sers

ſers of the Homilies intended ſhould not be taught. And That Article in the *Nicene* Creed, [*of One Subſtance with the Father*,] is now (through the Ambiguity of the *Latin* and *Engliſh* Tranſlation,) by moſt Men taken much otherwiſe, than the Council intended it: For the greater part of Modern Chriſtians, (if we may judge by the Writings of eminent Divines,) underſtand it (as if it had been ταυτοούσιον) to ſignify, *of one INDIVIDUAL Subſtance with the Father*; Whereas all learned Men know, that the Greek word * [ὁμοούσιον] never had any ſuch Signification, and that the Council † meant no ſuch thing; but, *of the ſame KIND of Subſtance with the Father*: [Ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, ſo the Council of *Nice* explained themſelves, though thoſe words are now left out of the Creed;] The Son was, they ſaid, γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς. *begotten of the Father, that is, from the Subſtance of the Father*: And therefore was not (which Notion was then univerſally condemned) himſelf *That individual Subſtance* from which he was begotten. But their meaning was; he was produced, not from any *Other* Subſtance, (as Man was formed from the Duſt of the Earth,) but, after an ineffable manner, from *the Subſtance of the Father only*. Which Senſe of theirs, is Now generally miſtaken. I ſee no poſſible Remedy for Theſe

† See *Cudworths Intellectual ſyſtem*, pag. 604 and 605.

Inconveniencies, but either plainly to declare (as the Church of *Rome* declared againſt the Beginners of the Reformation,) *Humane Forms of ſpeaking* to be abſolutely a *Rule of Faith and Opinion*, (which is indeed the ſame with Mr *Hobbs*'s Scheme of profeſſedly aboliſhing all Religion;) or elſe, on the contrary, to indeavour perpetually by all juſt and reaſonable means, to bring back words of obſcure and uncertain Signification, to the more plain and intelligible Rule of *Scripture*: Which is *holding faſt the Form of ſound Words*, 2 Tim. 1, 13.

I Proceed now to the Conſideration of *your Anonymous Friend*'s Book; which conſiſting of *Forty* ſelect Texts, I ſhall conſider thoſe *Forty* Texts in the ſame Order that He has done, after I have premiſed the two following *general Obſervations*.

Firſt, I obſerve, (as before,) that if thoſe *Forty* Texts *could* have been accommodated to *His* Notion, as I think *not one* of them can; yet it would not at all have followed that That Notion was right; becauſe I have alleged more than three Hundred *other* Texts, *beſides* thoſe Forty, which do *all of them* clearly expreſs the contrary. Now it has (you know) uſually been obſerved, that

that Men of All Sects and Opinions whatsoever, are apt to plead *Scripture* in their own Defense. The true Meaning of which observation is, that Men of almost Any Opinion may pick out some single Texts, which, when taken by themselves, shall seem to look in Favour of That Opinion. But the Method *I* used, was to set forth in One View *ALL* the Texts that in any manner related to the matter in Question; and, by comparing them together, I showed how they might *All* be reconciled in one uniform and consistent Scheme. *Your learned Friend* has not taken That Method; And therefore, had there been *more* Texts alleged, and *more favourable* to him, than Any of them really are; yet This would not have *Proved* any thing.

Secondly; I observe, that from those Texts which he *does* allege, he does not so much as *attempt* to *Prove* his Notion to be true; but only indeavours to *reconcile* the Texts he alleges, to the *Notion* or *Supposition* which he had before laid down in his own Mind. To which, if *All* the Texts he alleges, *could really* be reconciled, as *very Many* of them *cannot*; yet still here would be Nothing *proved*. Besides: What That *Notion* or *Supposition* is, which he *intends to establish*; is very hard to guess. For *sometimes* he affirms the *Person of the Son* pag. 51 to act *subordinately* to the *Person of the Father*,

ther, and denies him to be *Self-existent*,
pag. 64. which (he says) would be falling into *Sa-*
pag. 74. *bellianism:* At *other times* he says, the *Father and the Son* are *one and the same individual Being*, or *two persons in one and the same individual Being:* And at *another time* he makes them All *one and the same Person*,
pag. 28. when he says, *OF him as HE is Father, THROUGH him as HE is Son, TO him as HE is the Holy Ghost.* All which Notions are inconsistent with, and contradictory to, each other. For if they be All *one and the same individual Being*, how can *one and the same individual Being* be *subordinate* to itself? And if *HE* who is *Father*, be also himself both *Son* and *Holy Ghost*; then it will follow, that there is *no divine Nature* of *Christ* at all, but that *Christ* was only a *great Prophet*, in whom *God the Father* manifested himself extraordinarily; Which is downright *Socinianism.* So that indeed it is impossible your Friend's Arguments should be conclusive to *prove* any thing, when he does not so much as *know* distinctly what 'tis he *intends to prove.* Neither can he allege, that these things are *a Mystery:* For the *most evident Contradictions* are not a whit more *mysterious*, than the *most evident Truths.*

But to proceed to his *Texts* in *particular.*

No

N° 1.

MATT. XIX, 17. *There is none Good, but One, that is, God.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1 & 340. In the *Answer*, pag. 1.

Upon This Text I obſerved, that the word, *One*, according to the Nature of the Greek and Latin Languages, [ἑἷς, *Unus*,] muſt of neceſſity ſignify, *One Perſon*.

This, your learned Friend denies; and contends that it may as well or better ſignify, *One Being*. His Reaſons are,

That the word, *One*, [ἑἷς,] is Maſculine, by reaſon of its relation to *God*, [Θεὸς]

That it is no leſs fitted to repreſent *Being*, than *Perſon*; ſince they are neither of them Maſculine.

That the ſame word, [ἑἷς,] is uſed for *One Thing*, Gal. 3, 28, *Ye are all One*, [ἑἷς] *in Chriſt Jeſus*. Not *One Perſon*, for That (he ſays) is impoſſible; but, *One Thing*.

That the Vulgar Latin renders it ſo, [*Unum eſtis*,] *Ye are One thing* or *body*.

That *Theodoret* and *Theophylact*, (and doubtleſs *the Greeks were proper Judges of their own Language*,) explain it as ſignifying, ἓν σῶμα, *One Body*.

Laſtly, that as the ſame words in *Mar.* 2, 7, [εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ θεός,] are tranſlated, *but God only*; ſo *here* alſo they might better have been rendred, *but God only* or *God alone.*

And This (he ſays) *puts an End* to the Criticiſm of *Perſonality* founded upon the Term [εἷς, *Unus*,] *One.*

But the Obſervation is not ſo ſoon *put an End to*, as He conceives: For, his *Concluſion* runs much faſter than his *Premiſes.* And were it ever ſo true, that the word [εἷς] could juſtly be rendred, *One Being*; it would ſtill amount to the ſame thing: For *One Being*, when ſpoken of an *Intelligent Agent*, is the very ſame as *One Perſon*; Neither is there in Nature any other Notion of a *Perſon*, than as it ſignifies an *Intelligent Agent* or *Intelligent Being:* Whenever the word is uſed otherwiſe, no Man can tell what it ſignifies: And of What Uſe are words, when they have no Signification? Could therefore the word [εἷς] poſſibly have been rendred, as your Friend would have it, *One Being*; it would have availed him nothing, againſt any thing I had affirmed. But that it cannot poſſibly be ſo rendred, I ſtill affirm; and I am willing to put it upon This ſhort and plain iſſue: If there be Any One Paſſage in Any One Greek or Latin Writer in

in the World, accurate or inaccurate, wherein the word [εἷς, *Unus*,] or any other maſculine Adjective, placed abſolutely without any antecedent Subſtantive, (as ἀγαθὸς and εἷς are placed in this Text,) can poſſibly ſignify either *Thing* or *Being*, or any thing elſe beſides *Perſon*; I will acknowledge my Explication of This Text to be erroneous. Your Friend might as well have affirmed that, in Engliſh, the word, *Man*, ſignifies a *Houſe* or a *Ship*; or that *any other word* ſignifies *any other thing* whatſoever; as that the word, [εἷς, *Unus*,] can ſignify *Thing* or *Being*. 'Tis certain that Arguments run very low indeed, when all Grammar is forced to be reverſed in ſuch a manner, as would make every Language a mere Babel of words, without Any determinate Signification. By *Grammar*, I mean, not only the *artificial Rules* of *Grammarians*, but the common and natural Senſe of Mankind. As, when in Engliſh we uſe the word, *He*; 'tis impoſſible to mean thereby a *Thing* or a *Being* in general, but only an *Intelligent Agent or Being*, that is, a *Perſon*. Thus likewiſe in Greek, οἱ ὄντες, can ſignify nothing but *Perſons*; τὰ ὄντα, nothing but *Things*. When the *Platoniſts* ſpeak of *God*, conſidered merely as the *Self-exiſtent Being*, abſtract from the conſideration of Life, Action and Government; they then call him τὸ ὄν, *The Being*: But

when

when it is, ὁ ὤν, *He that exists*, it then always represents him as an *Agent* or *Person*. And the same Observation holds universally true in all cases, without exception.

But the word [εἷς] *One*, may in this Text *(he says)* be Masculine, by reason of its relation to *God*, [Θεὸς.] I answer; This cannot possibly be, because Then (the same being to be said of οὐδεὶς also,) the full construction would be, *There is None Good*, [οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς, *there is no God Good*,] *but One God, that is God:* Whereas the plain construction is, *There is no Person Good, but One Person, which is God.* Had our Saviour meant to say, (as he might, very properly,) *There is no Being Good, but One, that is, God*; (which yet would not have denoted *That sort of Goodness* which is *Moral*, but that which is *Natural* or *Metaphysical*;) he must have expressed it thus, οὐδὲν ἀγαθὸν, εἰ μὴ ἕν, ὁ Θεὸς: in like manner as the Philosopher says, οὐδὲν γελαστικὸν, εἰ μὴ ἕν, ὁ ἄνθρωπος, [*Nihil risibile est, nisi Unum, nempe Homo*;] *Nothing is capable of Laughter, but only One thing, namely Man*, or, *the Species of Mankind.* Had he said, οὐδεὶς γελαστικὸς, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ ἄνθρωπος, [*Nemo risibilis, nisi Unus, nempe Homo*;] *No One* [that is, No Person] *is capable of Laughter, but One, namely Man*, or *Mankind*; the Expression had been manifestly absurd:

abſurd: Which ſhows that theſe Two manners of Expreſſion cannot poſſibly be confounded. And though *Two different Sentences*, may ſometimes *by Accident* be nearly of the ſame import; (as, *There is No Being Good, but One, that is God*; or, *There is No Perſon Good, but One, that is God*;) yet the *ſame Words* that expreſs One of theſe Sentences, cannot poſſibly expreſs the Other.

Yes; the word [ἑἷς, *Unus, One,*] is no leſs fitted *(he ſays)* to repreſent *Being*, than *Perſon*; becauſe *Neither* of them are *Maſculine*. But This is a great miſtake: For the word, *Perſon*, is always expreſt both in Greek and Latin by the Maſculine Adjective, and by It Only; there being no other word either in Greek or Latin, by which it ever was or can poſſibly be expreſt. *Perſona*, and πρόσωπον, and ὑπόστασις, are all of them words of a quite different Senſe, and never uſed by any *good* Author (unleſs in very *figurative* Conſtructions) in this Signification. The Schoolmen have indeed, in their barbarous Language, made *Hypoſtaſis* to ſignify *Perſon*; but what they *mean* by the word, they themſelves know not.

But the ſame word [ἑἷς,] is uſed *(he ſays)* for *One Thing*, Gal. 3, 28, *Ye are all One* [ἑἷς] *in Chriſt Jeſus*: "Not *one* "*Perſon*; for That *(he ſays)* is impoſſible; "but,

" but, *One Thing*". I anſwer: *Literally* ſpeaking, the whole Number of Chriſt's Diſciples can no more properly be called *One Thing*, than *One Perſon*; and *figuratively* ſpeaking, they may as well be called *One Perſon*, as *One Thing*. And that *St Paul does* in this place *intend* to call the Church, in ſuch a figurative manner of ſpeaking, *One Perſon*; (beſides that the word, ἑἷς, neceſſarily ſo ſignifies,) will appear from the following conſiderations. In the whole New Teſtament it is very uſual to compare the *Chriſtian Church* to a *Body*, whereof *Chriſt* is the *Head*; and particular Chriſtians (ſaith the Apoſtle) are *Members of his Body, of his Fleſh, and of his Bones*, Eph. 5, 30. In purſuance of which elegant Similitude, the Church is often repreſented under the Notion of a *Perſon*, under the Character of the *Spouſe* of Chriſt: 2 *Cor.* 11, 2, *I have eſpouſed you to one Husband, that I may preſent you a chaſte Virgin* [ὑμᾶς παρθένον ἁγνὴν] *to Chriſt:* And *Rev.* 21, 9; 19, 7, *I will ſhow thee the Bride, the Lambs Wife;—The marriage of the Lamb is come, and his Wife has made herſelf ready; and to Her was granted, that ſhe ſhould be arrayed in fine Linen, clean and white; for the fine Linen is the Righteouſneſs of Saints.* Again; *Eph.* 2, 15, *To make in himſelf, of twain,* (viz. of Jews and

and Gentiles,) *one new Man*, ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον. Thus likewise in the passage before us, *Gal.* 3, 27, *Ye have put on Christ*; *There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither Bond nor Free, there is neither Male nor Female*; *for ye are all* [εἷς,] considered as *One Person in Christ Jesus*. Your learned Friend did not at all perceive the Elegancy and Beauty of the Apostle's Expression in this Place. Consider the Church as *One Thing*, as a *Congregation or Body of Men*, and all these *natural Relations* still continue *distinct*; But consider it under the Notion of *one Person*, the *Spouse of Christ*, and then all these differences and distinctions *vanish*. By the same Figure of Speech, the *Jewish Church* is stiled in Scripture *the Daughter of Sion: Nations and Empires* are, in the Prophecy of *Daniel*, personated as *Kings*: The *Church* in the *Revelation*, under Persecution, is *a Woman flying into the Wilderness*: The *False Church* abusing the temporal Power of Princes, to persecute good Christians; is *the Woman, the Whore, riding upon a Scarlet-coloured* (or *bloody*) *Beast*. *Deceivers and False-Teachers*, are *The False-Prophet*, Rev. 19, 20, *The Beast—and the False-Prophet were cast alive into a Lake of Fire*: The Body of corrupt Christians in the latter Ages of the World, are *The Man of Sin*, 2 Th. 2, 3; and *Anti-Christ*; 2 Joh. 7, *Many Deceivers are entred into the World*,

COLLEGE LIBRARY NEW JERSEY

World, who confeſs not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh; This is [ὁ πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος] *The Deceiver and The Anti-Chriſt.* You ſee, Sir, your learned Friend concluded ſomewhat too faſt, when he thought he had *put an end to the Criticiſm of Perſonality founded upon the Term,* ἕις, *Unus.*

Well; but the *Vulgar Latin* (he ſays) renders it, [*Unum eſtis,*] *Ye are One Thing* or *Body.* I acknowledge it: And 'tis a great confirmation of what I have ſaid. For, the Reaſon why the Author of That Tranſlation did not render it *Unus,* as *Beza* rightly does; was becauſe he knew that *Unus* could not poſſibly ſignify any thing elſe than *One Perſon:* Which He not apprehending how it could ſtand in that place, nor perceiving the Beauty of *St Paul*'s ſimilitude; inſtead therefore of rendring the Apoſtles word which he underſtood not, he put in another of his own which he underſtood better, and thereby altered and quite ſpoiled the Apoſtles Senſe.

Theodoret and *Theophylact,* were not *Tranſlators,* but *Commentators.* They therefore might juſtly *paraphraſe* the Apoſtles Expreſſion, by the Phraſe [ἓν σῶμα] *One Body.* But though This be of the ſame import, as to the *main of the Senſe,* with the Apoſtles word [ἕις] *One Perſon*; yet it does not therefore follow, that, in any poſ-

ſible

sible Construction, the word εἷς signifies ἓν σῶμα; any more than it follows that the word *Paulus* signifies in Latin *an Apostle*, because a Commentator may happen (without spoiling the Sense) to put the word *Apostle* instead of *Paul*.

Lastly, because the same words [εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ θεὸς] are in *Mar.* 2, 7, paraphrastically rendred, *but God only*; therefore *here* also *(he says)* they might better have been rendred after the same manner. But, in right reasoning, just the contrary is true. Because these words in the place before us are rendred, not paraphrastically, but literally and exactly; therefore in That other passage of *St Mark*, they ought to have been rendred so likewise.

I add only, (though I depend not on Authorities,) that *Clemens Alexandrinus*, (when he paraphraseth, *One that is God*, by the words, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, *My Father which is in Heaven*;) and *Origen*, (when he recites the words thus, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, *there is none Good, but One, which is God, even the Father*;) and *Novatian*, and *Athanasius* himself, interpret This Text exactly as I do. As I have shown in my *Scripture-Doctrine*, No 340. To which may be further added *Irenæus*, who cites the words thus, εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. *There is One that is Good, even the Father which is in Heaven*,

lib.

lib. 1, c. 20, aliàs 17. And *Clemens Alexandrinus* again, when he says, οὐ μόνον ὄντα Θεὸν πατέρα ἀγαθὸν, χαρακτηρίζει ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸς, *whom our Saviour and God declares to be alone Good, even God the Father*, Strom. 7. And *Justin Martyr*, who cites the words thus, Εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, *There is One that is Good, even my Father which is in Heaven*, Dial. cum Tryph.

N° 2.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 2. In the *Answer*, pag. 3.

MARK XII, 29. *The first of all the Commandments, is; Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.* [or, *the Lord our God, even the Lord, is One.*]

The only Observation your learned Friend makes upon This Text, is; that *God* is here said to be *One*, only *in opposition to Idols* or the *False Gods of the Nations*. Be it so: The Question then remains, *Who* That God is, of whom this is spoken. The *Jews* to be sure, when these words were spoken by *Moses*, could understand them of no other than of the *Almighty Father*, *the Creator and Governor of all things*: And the *natural Apprehension*, or *common Sense of Mankind*, obviously leads *all Men* to understand them after the same manner. In the *New*

New Teſtament, whenever theſe words are referred to, they are ſtill always underſtood in the ſame ſenſe. Our *Lord himſelf*, ſpeaking of his *Father*, calls him the *Only True God*, Joh. 17, 3. And *St. Paul*, after One Spirit, and One Lord, mentioning in the laſt and higheſt place *One God*, calls Him [*viz.* That One God,] *The Father of All, who is above all*, Eph. 4, 6. And when he had ſaid, that *to Us* Chriſtians *there is but One God*; he adds, by way of Explication, *The Father, of whom are all things*, 1 Cor. 8, 6. And in more than 300 *other* places of the New Teſtament, the word, *God*, is by the conſtruction of the words with which it is joyned, of neceſſity confined to the Perſon of the *Father* ſingly: As appears in the Paſſages themſelves, collected in my *Scripture-doctrine*, *Part I*, *Ch. I*, *Sect.* 2. And *Athanaſius* himſelf, expreſsly interprets the words of the Text now before us, to be meant of *God the Father*; in two paſſages cited in my *Scripture-doctrine*, *Part I*, N° 2. And not only the *ſame Author* in other places, but *Clemens Romanus* alſo, and *Ignatius*, and *Juſtin*, and *Irenæus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Tertullian*, and *Origen*, and *Novatian*, and *Euſebius*, and *Hilary*, (if the matter was to be decided by Authority,) ſpeak after the ſame manner, in the paſſages which I have cited from them in my *Scripture-doctrine*, *Part*

II, § 9. Well; But if This be ſo, is *Chriſt* then excluded alſo among the *Falſe Gods?* I anſwer: When *God the Father* is thus ſtiled *The One God*; Idols, in *oppoſition* to him, are excluded hereby from being *Gods at all*; and the Son, in *ſubordination* to him, is excluded, *not* from being *truly God*, but from being *That Perſon*, *That Supreme*, *Independent*, *Self-exiſtent Governour of All*, who, upon theſe accounts, is ſtiled, by way of Eminence, the *One* and *Only God*, while the *Son* is nevertheleſs, by *communication of divine Power and Dominion from the Father*, really and truly *God*. This is very conſiſtent and intelligible: And the Paſſages your Friend cites out of *Athanaſius*, muſt either thus be reconciled with the expreſs words which I had before cited from him, wherein he interprets theſe Texts exactly as I do; or elſe he unavoidably contradicts himſelf. *Irenæus*, as I have already ſhown, explains this whole matter at large, in his whole *Sixth Chapter of his Third Book*, with as much accuracy, as if he had written on purpoſe againſt your Friends unintelligible Notion. And therefore, when he ſays in another place, that *He who made all things, is, together with his Word, juſtly ſtiled the Only God and Lord*; (unleſs the Greek perhaps ſignified, that *He who made*

* See *above*, *pag.* 11.

Ita ut is quidem, qui omnia fecerit, cum Verbo ſuo, juſtè dicatur Deus & Dominus Solus. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 8.

made all things by his Word, is justly stiled the Only God and Lord; in like manner as he had been showing a little before in That same Chapter, that *He who is the God over All, made all things by* [Christ] *his word*;) 'tis evident his Meaning, to speak consistently with Himself, must be, (not such a Confusion of Persons as your Friend introduces, but) what he *explicitly and copiously* declares in the fore-cited * Sixth Chapter of the same Book, and in numerous other places; *viz.* that the *Son* is *truly God and Lord*, by having *RECIEVED Dominion over the whole Creation*, from *the Father*, who being of Himself absolute *Lord of All*, is by way of Eminence the *One* and *Only God.* But still you will always remember, that the Question must finally be decided, not by *Humane Authority*, but by the *Words of Scripture.*

* See *above*, pag. 11.

N° 3.

MARK XII, 32. *There is One God, and there is None other but He.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 3. In the *Answer*, pag. 6.

It cannot be doubted but the *Scribe*, when he spake these words, meant the *One Supreme Governour of the Universe*, even Him who was known to the Jews by the

Title of *the Creator of Heaven and Earth*, and who is declared to us Chriſtians by the Title of *the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. That the Writers of the New Teſtament did not *alter* the known Signification of the words, *One God*; I have ſhown under the fore-going Head. That the Chriſtian Writers in all Antiquity underſtood the words, *one God*, to ſignify the *Father*; I have ſhown by a very large Collection of Teſtimonies, in my *Scripture-doctrine*, *Part II*, § 9. Your Learned Friend *Himſelf* acknowledges in this very place, that *the Father* Alone is [Αυτοθεος] *He who derives his Being and Godhead from no Cauſe*; and conſequently that He alone is, in that ſenſe, the *One God*. But however, the Terms *One God* (he ſays) are uſed in no ſuch Meaning in This Text. And *Why* not in this Text? Why, becauſe the words are uſed here (*he ſays*) in oppoſition only to *Falſe Gods*, and therefore ought not to be confined to the *Father Alone*, ſo as to *exclude the Son*. So as to exclude him *from what*? From being *He who alone derives his Being and Godhead from no Cauſe*, your Friend expreſsly allows that He is always excluded: And God forbid that I ſhould ever argue, for excluding him from being *God* in any other reſpect. He *is really, and truly God* (which *no falſe Gods* are,) by *deriving real and true Divinity* from the

p. 3.

the ineffable Power of Him, who Alone has *an unoriginated Being and Godhead.* Wherein then does your Learned Friend and I differ? I think, in *This* only; that, after allowing a clear *diſtinction*, he ſtill contends for ſuch an unintelligible way of ſpeaking, as either neceſſarily introduces, or at leaſt cannot be vindicated from introducing, a *Confuſion of Perſons.*

As to his Citations from the *Fathers* upon this Head; though I do not think myſelf at all concerned to reconcile to each other the different ways of ſpeaking found in the Fathers; yet I cannot but deſire the Reader to compare the *Few* Places here cited by your Friend out of *Three* Fathers, with *ten times* the Number of places cited by Me out of the Same and many More Fathers, in my *Scripture-doctrine, Part II,* § 9. By which it will appear, that Much the greater Number of Ancient Writers declare themſelves with the greateſt poſſible diſtinctneſs to have underſtood This and the like Texts, exactly as I do; and that Thoſe who ſpeak more confuſedly, (as when *Tertullian ſays*, Deus ſe Unicum, ſed cum Filio, oſtendit; *God declares himſelf to be One only, but yet together with his Son*;) did not mean, as your learned Friend does, [*Deum & Filium eſſe unicum,*] that *God and the Son of God* were *One Individual*; but, that *God* was *ſo One*, [*ut tamen Filium haberet,*]

beret,] that yet nevertheleſs it was to be maintained, againſt *Jews* and *Heathens*, that he had *a Son* to whom he had communicated true Divine Dominion over the whole Creation. *Tertullian* himſelf, (though, as to the *metaphyſical* Point, he introduced indeed a Confuſed Notion of the *Son*'s being a *PART* of the *Father's Subſtance*, in like manner as a Branch is Part of a Tree ;) yet, as to the *preſent* Queſtion, he expreſly aſſerts *God* to be *One*, in the ſame Senſe that the *Monarch* of a Country is the *One* and *Only King*, notwithſtanding that he be ſuppoſed to have an Only Son, whom he has receiv'd into the Whole Adminiſtration of the Government with himſelf ; *See Scripture-doctrine*, *pag.* 334. *Novatian*, out of whom your Friend here cites one ſingle Sentence, does every where ſo expreſsly aſſert all that I contend for ; that a Reader, who pleaſes to peruſe his Book, will be amazed to find the Whole of it, from the Beginning to the End, to be written on purpoſe to eſtabliſh the very Notion I am pleading for. *Athanaſius* himſelf underſtands the Words *One God*, in the Text before us, to be meant of the *Perſon of the Father* ; though he adds, (and ſo far indeed very rightly,) that This is not to be underſtood [ἐς ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ υἱοῦ] ſo as to deſtroy the Divinity of the Son. Laſtly, the Paſſage of *Origen*, (one Scrap of which your

your Friend cites, and thus tranſlates, *We worſhip One God, who is both Father and Son*;) is itſelf, when the Whole of it appears together, a large Explication what He thought the Senſe of the Church to have been in His days concerning this matter: *If any one* (ſays he) *is diſturbed at theſe Expreſſions, as if we favoured the Opinion of Thoſe* [the Sabellians] *who deny the Father and the Son to be Two diſtinct Subſiſtencies; let him conſider That Text* (Acts 4, 32,) All that believed, were of One Heart and of One Soul; *and then He will underſtand This*, I and my Father are One Thing. *We ſerve therefore, in the Senſe I have now explained, One God, the Father, and the Son.——We worſhip the Father of the Truth, and* [alſo] *the Son who is the Truth; being indeed Two things in Subſiſtence; but in Agreement and Conſent and Sameneſs of Will, they are One.* There are in My Book Many Citations of Paſſages, wherein Authors expreſsly grant (and *intended* to grant) what perhaps is very difficult to reconcile with ſome of their own Concluſions: And in citing ſuch Paſſages, there is (as I have largely ſhown) no unfairneſs, but

Εἰ δέ τις ἐκ τούτων πεισπαθήσεται, μή πη αὐτομολῶμεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀναιρέντας δύο ἶναι ὑποστάσεις πατέρα καὶ υἱόν· ἐπισκοπάτω τὸ, Ἦν δὲ πάντων τῶν πιστευσάντων ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ Ψυχὴ μία, ἵνα θεωρήσῃ τὸ, Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμέν. Ἕνα ἓν θεὸν, ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν θεραπεύομεν.—— Θρησκεύομεν ἓν τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἓν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος. Contra Celſ. lib. 8.

the greateſt Strength of Argument. But I have never cited any paſſage, as your Friend (though in the Whole a very fair and ſincere Writer) has happened to cite This of *Origen*, ſo as to make it appear to the Reader directly contrary to what the Author intended to expreſs in *That Very Paſſage.*

N° 4.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 5. In the *Anſwer*, pag. 9.

JOH. XVII, 3. *That they might know Thee, the Only True God; and Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent.*

Theſe words, it hath been ſuppoſed, may be underſtood Two ways.

Either Thus: *That they might know Thee, the Only True God; and* [that they might know] *Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent.*

Or Thus: *That they might know Thee, the Only True God; and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*, [the Only True God alſo.]

The *former* is, I think, the True Senſe of the words; your learned Friend thinks the *latter* to be ſo.

The

The Reaſons for *My Opinion*, are:

1. That the obvious and natural Conſtruction of the words, is This: *That they might know Thee*, [who art] *the Only True God*; *and* [that they might alſo know] *Jeſus Chriſt*, [who is] *He whom thou haſt ſent*, [viz. the True Meſſiah.] Eſpecially, if it be obſerved how the latter words are diſpoſed in the Greek; [ὃν ἀπέστειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, *and Him whom thou haſt ſent, even Jeſus Chriſt.*] The *other* Interpretation of the words, is ſo forced and unnatural; that an *unprejudiced* Reader will eaſily be determined, even by That conſideration alone, to reject it.

2. In each of the *other* places of the New Teſtament, where the *True God* is mentioned, it ſignifies, by way of Eminence, the *Perſon of the Father*. In 1 *Theſſ.* 1, 9, 'tis evidently and indiſputably ſo, becauſe expreſsly contradiſtinguiſhed from the *Perſon of the Son* in the very words of the Text it ſelf: *Ye turned to God from Idols, to ſerve the* Living and True God, *and to wait for* His Son *from Heaven.* The other paſſage, 1 *Joh.* 5, 20, ſhall be conſidered by and by, in its proper place. In like manner, the other places of Scripture where the *One* or *Only God* is mentioned, do All of them really, and ſome of them moſt evidently, mean thereby the *Perſon of the Father* ſingly.

Thus

Thus 1 *Cor.* 8, 6, *To Us there is but* One God, *the* Father; *and One Lord, Jesus Christ.* And *Eph.* 4; 4, 5, 6, *One Spirit,—One Lord,—One* God *and* Father *of all, who is above all &c.* And *Jude* 4, *The* Only Lord God, *and* our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. *All* the Writers in the *Three First Centuries*, (if the Reader thinks fit to be determined by Authorities,) whenever they refer to the Text before us, understand it as I do. Your Friend mentions two of these Writers, *Origen* and *Novatian*. *Origen*, he yields me: and *Novatian* interprets the Text just as I do, in those very words which your Friend cites as an Argument to the contrary.

4. Many even of the *Later* Fathers also, understand this Text, as I do; Which nothing but the mere Evidence of the thing itself, could have obliged them to. *Athanasius* thus; ὅτε μόνῳ λέγεται ὁ πατὴρ θεὸς, *When the Father is stiled the Only God*, &c. Τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν, τὸν τοῦ χριστοῦ πατέρα, *The True God, even the Father of Christ*, &c. Μόνον θεὸν ἀληθῆ,—τίς δ' ἔν ἐστιν ἕτος, ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ τοῦ χριστοῦ πατήρ; *The Only True God,——Who is He but the Father of Christ?* Τὸν ἕνα καὶ μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν,—λέγω δὲ τὸν τοῦ χριστοῦ πατέρα, *The One and Only True God, I mean the Father of Christ*, &c.

See *Scripture-doctrine, pag.* 4. & 254.

&c. Ὅτι ὁ παρωθεὶς κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ πατὴρ οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδ' (ὡς ἐκεῖνοι φαῖεν) ὁ μόνος Θεός, ἅπασαι μαρτυροῦσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ, *That Jesus Christ our Lord and God incarnate, is not the Father; and that He is not (as the Sabellians would have it,) That Only God; the Holy Scriptures every where testify.* Also *Hilary* thus; Non Patri adimitur, quod Deus Unus sit, quia & Filius Deus sit; ob id Unus Deus, quia ex se Deus: *The Son's being God, does not hinder the Father from being the One God; For He is therefore the One God, because He is Self-existent God.*

5. The Learned *Bishop Pearson*, (Expos. on the Creed, pag. 40;) and the Learned *Bishop Bull*, (Defens. Sect. 4, cap. 1, §. 2,) both of them expressly acknowledge these words, *The Only True God*, to be meant, in This Text, of the *Father* only, by way of supreme Eminence, in contradistinction to the *Son* who was *sent* by him.

The Reasons *your Learned Friend* alleges for understanding this Text the other way, are:

1. That the Term, *Only*, does not always exclude every thing else but the Subject to which it is applied. *pag.* 11.

2. That the Doctrine the Text contains according to His Interpretation of it, is *pag.* 12.

found

found evidently in another place of Scripture, *viz.* 1 *Joh.* 5, 20.

3. That the word, *Only*, is added merely in opposition to Idols and false Gods.

pag. 13 & 14. 4. That several Fathers understand the Words in *His* sense: That *Athanasius* in *other* places explains himself, as to his Meaning in the places I cited from him: And that *Origen*'s sense, which he acknowledges to be the same with mine, *may be as difficult to be proved out of Scripture, as his critical Remark, that the Article* [ὁ] *prefixed to* [Θεὸς,] *appropriates the Name to God the Father.*

Now to these Reasons, I reply:

1. To deny that the Term, *Only*, always excludes every thing else, but the Subject it is applied to; is to deny that Words have any Signification. For if the word, *Only* or *Alone*, does not *appropriate*; there is no word in any Language, which *can* appropriate any thing to any Subject.

pag. 9. But He alleges an Instance: "*Eccluſ.* 24, "5, Wisdom says of herself, *I alone com-* "*passed the Circuit of Heaven:* Which "surely, *says he*, does not exclude the Fa- "ther;——And if the Term, *Only*, does "not exclude the Father, we cannot ne- "cessarily infer that it does the Son". But now the Difference is This: The *Wisdom of God the Father*, does not exclude

God

God the Father, becauſe it is itſelf nothing but an *Attribute of God the Father*; and to ſay that the *Wiſdom of God* does any thing, is only ſaying in other words that *God* does it *himſelf*. But affirming any thing to belong to *One Perſon Alone*, is of neceſſity denying that ſame thing to belong to *any Other Perſon* in the *ſame ſenſe*. Whatever therefore is appropriated to the *Father alone*, is of neceſſity denied to belong to the *Son* in that ſame ſenſe, in which it is appropriated to the *Father*. Unleſs it be declared (according to the *Sabellian* Notion, which upon the Whole amounts to the very ſame with *Socinianiſm*;) that the *Son* is not a *real Perſon*, but a *mere Attribute of the Father*. Which Opinion your Friend diſclaims, though his Reaſoning here neceſſarily ſuppoſes it.

2. That the words, *This is the True God*, 1 *Joh.* 5, 20, are not ſpoken of the Son; I ſhall ſhow by and by, in its proper place, *No* 14.

3. That the word, *Only*, is added merely in oppoſition to Idols or Falſe Gods, is a great Miſtake. For the word, *Only*, of neceſſity always appropriates ſomewhat to the Subject it is applied to, not only excluſive of every thing which That Subject is *oppoſed to*, but alſo of every thing which That Subject is *contradiſtinguiſhed from*. The *Son*, is not (as *Falſe Gods* are) *oppoſite*

to

to the *Father*, but *contradiſtinguiſhed from* him: And when the *Father* is, in this Prayer of our Saviour, ſtiled the *Only True God*; this Title is appropriated to him not only becauſe Idols are *Falſe Gods*, but becauſe *He only is the Subject* whom our Saviour was ſpeaking of in theſe Words. In that paſſage of *St Paul*, 1 *Theſſ.* 1, 9, *Ye turned to God from* Idols, *to ſerve the* Living and True God, *and to wait for* His Son *from Heaven*; the *Father* is ſtiled the *Living and True God*, not only in oppoſition to *Idols* which are *No Gods*, but expreſsly alſo in contradiſtinction to *his Son expected from Heaven*; who is *True God* by communication of Divinity from the Father, while at the ſame time *the Father* is therefore (as *Hilary* and moſt other Fathers expreſs it) juſtly ſtiled by way of eminence the *One and Only True God*, as having Alone his Divinity (or Supreme Dominion) of Himſelf abſolute and underived.

4. As to Authorities; your Friend mentions none in the *Firſt Three Centuries*, but *Origen*, whom he gives up; and *Novatian*, whoſe words prove juſt the contrary to what he cites them for: *We muſt believe*, ſaith That Father, *in the Lord, the Only True God*; *and, by conſequence, in Jeſus Chriſt whom He* [viz. the Only True God] *hath ſent.* *Novatian* does indeed add, that our Lord would

would not have added the latter part of the words, unleſs he had expected that *He himſelf* alſo ſhould have been believed to be *God*. But *Novatian*'s meaning herein is, that Chriſt is *God* by having *received True Divine Dominion over the whole Creation, from and in Subordination to the Father*. For the Deſign of his whole Book from the Beginning to the End, is to prove *this very thing*, and in the *very ſame manner* as I have explained it. The Reader, when he peruſes *Novatian*'s Book, will be ſurprized to find how *exceeding clearly and diſtinctly he explains this whole matter*.

The Paſſages your Friend cites out of *Hilary*, I deſire the Reader to compare with That which I have cited *juſt above*, [pag. 59,] out of the ſame Author.

The Paſſages *I* cited out of *Athanaſius*, your Friend deſires the Reader to compare with ſome other paſſages of the ſame Author: Which *I* alſo deſire him to do; And if he cannot reconcile theſe with the others which I firſt cited, he will then obſerve that thoſe others are ſo much the ſtronger Evidences of what I alleged them for, as being the Conceſſions of a perſon who was himſelf of a different Opinion.

Nazianzen's Argument is this: If the former part of the words [*that they might know Thee the Only True God*,] had been meant of the *Father* Only; [ἀντιδιῃρῆς,]

if

if it had been meant of him in *contradiſtinction* to the *Son*; then there would not have been added theſe latter words, [*and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.*] Where the Force of This Argument lies, I confeſs I underſtand not, but leave it to be conſidered by the Reader. One would naturally think, that theſe latter words *were added* for That very Reaſon, for which the good Father ſuppoſed they ought *not to have been added.* For, taking the *True God* to be meant in oppoſition to *Idols* or *Falſe Gods*, (as *Nazianzen* explains it;) then our Saviour's prayer is, that Men forſaking all *Idols* and *Falſe Gods*, may know *The Only True God*, and *Him who was Truly ſent forth from That Only True God.*

Ambroſe's Argument is, that the Conjunction [*And,*] never *ſeparates* things, but *joins* them together. By the ſame Argument, when the Scripture ſays that the people feared *the Lord AND Samuel*, it would follow that the *Lord and Samuel* were one and the ſame Individual. Were *I* an Admirer of *Ambroſe*, I would certainly have forborn citing out of him ſo *ridiculous* an Argument.

Origen, your Learned Friend allows to be clearly on my ſide. His words I ſhall here repeat, becauſe I am willing to take This opportunity of correcting a Miſtake, which (though your Friend was ſo kind as not

not to take notice of it) I was guilty of in my Tranſlation of That paſſage. *Hence* (ſays *Origen*) *we may ſolve the Scruple of many Pious perſons, who, through Fear leaſt they ſhould make Two Gods, fall into Falſe and wicked Notions: (either on the One ſide, denying the Real Perſonality of the Son diſtinct from the Father; and ſo, while they* [rightly] *acknowledge his Divinity, making him* [erroneouſly] *to be in reality nothing but a mere Name: Or elſe on the contrary, denying* [erroneouſly] *his Divinity, while they* [rightly] *acknowledge his Real Perſonality, and that his Subſiſtence is truly and properly diſtinct from that of the Father:) This ſcruple, I ſay, of many Pious perſons, may thus be ſolved. We muſt tell them, that He who is of Himſelf God, is That* GOD; *(as our Saviour, in his Prayer to his Father, ſays,* That they may know Thee the Only True God;) *but that Whatever is God, beſides That Self-exiſtent Perſon, being ſo only by Communication of His Divinity, cannot ſo properly be ſtiled* [ὁ Θεὸς] *That God, but rather* [Θεος] *a*

Καὶ τὸ πολλὰς φιλοθέους εἶναι εὐχομένης παράσον, ἐυλαβουμένους δύο ἀναγορεῦσαι θεοὺς, καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο πεσιπτωτας Ψευδέσι καὶ ἀσεβέσι δόγμασιν, ἤτοι ἀρνουμένους ἰδιότητα υἱοῦ ἑτέραν παρὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁμολογοῦντας θεὸν εἶναι τὸν μέχει ὀνόματος παρ' αὐτοῖς θεὸν προσαγορευόμενον· ἢ ἀρνουμένους τὴν θεότητα τοῦ υἱοῦ, πᾶσάντας δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἰδιότητα. καὶ τὴν ὡσίαν κατὰ περιγραφὴν τυγχάνουσαν ἑτέραν τοῦ πατρός) ἐντεῦθεν λυέσθαι δύναται. Λεκτέον γὰρ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τότε μὲν αὐτόθεος ὁ Θεὸς ἐστὶ διότι καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐχῇ, ἵνα γινώσκωσι σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν· πᾶν δὲ τὸ παρὰ τὸ Αὐτόθεος, μετοχῇ τῆς ἐκείνης θεότητος θεοποιούμενον, οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ θεὸς κυριώτερον ἂν λέγοιτο. *in Joh. pag.* 46, *Huetii.*

Divine Perſon. It is not poſſible that Any Words ſhould expreſs the Senſe of the Primitive Church more fully, more clearly, more diſtinctly, than theſe do. Your Friend therefore fairly gives up *Origen*,
pag. 13. and makes only the following Reply. *Perhaps* (ſays he) *it may be as difficult to prove This ſenſe of the words*, [viz. that *The only true God* ſignifies the *Father*, as being αὐτόθεος God unoriginated,] *out of Scripture*, (*which the Doctor profeſſes to be his Rule in theſe Matters*;) *as it is to make good the critical Remark of the ſame Father* [Origen,] *that the Article* [ὁ] *prefixed to the word* [Θεὸς,] *appropriates the Name to God the Father*; *when it is evident, that the Son is called God with the ſame Article, by his Diſciple Thomas*, Joh. 20, 28, ὁ Θεός μου· *And by St Paul alſo in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, ch. 1, 8, *which is taken from* Pſ. 45, 6: *To ſay nothing of Writers Older than Origen*; *and even of Origen himſelf, who deſtroys his Criticiſm in his own Writings, as will appear from One Inſtance that may ſerve for others*, μεταμορφώθη ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, *which he uſes of the Son*, lib. 4, contr. Celſum. All This, is exceeding ſtrange indeed. To prove *out of Scripture*, what the Senſe of the words in queſtion is, was what I indeavoured in my *Scripture-doctrine*. To That, it has been anſwered, that we ought alſo to take in the Senſe of the *Primitive*

mitive Church. What the Senſe of the *Primitive Church* was, is with all poſſible Accuracy here deſcribed by *Origen.* And to This, it is anſwered, that *Perhaps it may be difficult to prove this Senſe out of Scripture.* And how difficult? why, *as difficult as to make good the critical Remark of* †*Origen, that the Name* [ὁ Θεὸς] *is appropriated to God the Father.* I made no Uſe of that critical Remark, in My Book; and yet your learned Friend is very *unfortunate,* in aſſerting that That Remark is evidently falſe. 'Tis not good to be confident about an *Univerſal Negative,* and therefore I will not preſume to ſay that ὁ θεὸς was never uſed by any Writer concerning any other than God the Father: But This I can affirm, that, as far as I have been able to obſerve, I could never *find* That Title given abſolutely to * any Other perſon, either in *the Scripture,* or in Any Writer *before Origen,* or in *Origen himſelf,* or in Any Writer *after Origen.* All Men that underſtand Language, know that ὁ θεός μου, is quite a different thing from ὁ θεὸς abſolutely. St *Thomas*'s ὁ θεός μου, is ſpoken of Him, whoſe God and Father is ὁ θεός. St *Paul*'s ὁ θεός, is the Vocative Caſe from θεός. And *Origen*'s ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, is juſt as different from ὁ θεὸς abſolutely, as was St *Thomas*'s ὁ θεός μου. Ὁ θεὸς abſolutely, is

† Note, the ſame Remark is largely inſiſted on by *Euſebius, de Eccleſiaſt. Theol. lib.* 2, *cap.* 17, commenting upon *Joh.* 1, 1.

* In *Clemens Alexandrinus* it is given to the Father and Son conſidered together, as *God and his Word*; in ſuch a manner as to make them but One and the ſame perſon: wherein That Father is not conſiſtent with himſelf.

the ſame as ὁ παντοκράτωρ, or ὁ ὑπὲρ πάντων θεός. Wherefore He who is abſolutely ὁ θεός, may very well be, and often is called, θεὸς: But it does not therefore follow, that He who is truly θεὸς, may on the other ſide be as properly ſtiled ὁ θεός. The Paſſage which comes neareſt it, is one omitted by your Friend, *Rom.* 9, 5, ὁ ὢν ὑπὲρ πάντων θεὸς; which, if *allowed* to be certainly ſpoken of Chriſt, yet is not the ſame as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, ὁ ὢν ὁ ὑπὲρ πάντων θεός.

N° 5.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 2. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 14.

1 Cor. VIII; 4, 5, 6. *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is None other God but One.——For though there be that are called——Gods many and Lords many;——to Us there is but One God,* [viz.] *the Father, of whom are all things and we in him; and One Lord,* [viz.] *Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by Him.*

Theſe words are ſo expreſs and full a declaration of *God the Father*'s being by way of Eminence the *One God*, that there are no poſſible words by which it could have been aſſerted more explicitly. Had the

the Apoſtle ſaid only, *To Us there is but One God, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; there had really, according to the Analogy of Scripture, been no Ambiguity: But when he adds by way of Interpretation, as it were on purpoſe to prevent all poſſibility of miſtake, *there is but One God, the FATHER*; *and one Lord, Jeſus Chriſt*; it is a very ſurprizing thing, to find a Learned and Sincere Man indeavouring to put another Senſe upon the words, *One God*; different from That which the Apoſtle in ſuch expreſs words declares himſelf to mean.

But (ſays your learned Friend) *it is plain here, that the Unity of God is affirmed in oppoſition to Idols.* Very true: But it is plain alſo, that *the God*, whoſe Unity is here ſo affirmed, is by the Apoſtle expreſsly declared to be *the Father.* pag. 14.

But (adds your Friend,) *though the Father be ſaid to be the One God, yet this is not ſpoken to the excluſion of the Son, who has been proved to be comprehended in the One God.* That *the Father*'s being by way of Eminence *the One God*, does not exclude *the Son* from being *truly God* by *true communication of Divinity* from that *one unoriginated God the Father*, I readily acknowledge. But to ſay that the *One God the Father* is *the Son* alſo, and not *the Father only*; or that the *Son* is not excluded from pag. 15.

being *That One God*, which is the *Perſon of the Father*; this is directly affirming that *Two Perſons* are *one and the ſame Perſon*; Which is the utmoſt Confuſion.

pag. 16. But (ſays your Friend further,) *the Son is comprehended in the One God the Father, as He is the Word: But foraſmuch as the Son is not only God, but God and Man conſiſting of two Natures; and, by reaſon of That Union, cannot be comprehended, as to his whole Perſon, under any One of them; therefore does he ſeem to be mentioned after God the Father, as a Being diſtinct from pure Deity, ſuch as the Father is; though his Superiour Nature, or God the Word, is comprehended in it.* I anſwer: Not only *God the Father*, but *God the Father and Son and Holy Ghoſt*, muſt needs by your Friend be allowed to be *Pure Deity:* And conſequently, if the Apoſtle had here mentioned *Jeſus Chriſt* in the ſecond place (as your Friend ſuppoſes) only upon Account of his being (as God-man) a *Being diſtinct from pure Deity*; he muſt have ſaid, not, *One God, the Father*; but *One God, the Father and Son and Holy Ghoſt*; and *one Lord* (or God-man) *Jeſus Chriſt.* Beſides; When your Friend affirms *the Son* to be comprehended (in the Senſe we are now ſpeaking of) in *the One God the Father*, as He is the *Word*; What does This import, but

but either that the word *Father* ſignifies both *Father and Son*, (which is to affirm that *One Perſon* is *Two Perſons*;) or elſe that he ſuppoſes the *Son*, becauſe he is called *The Word*, to be only an *Attribute or Power of the Father*, and not any Perſon at all?

Authorities for his Interpretation of this Text, your Friend alleges None: Becauſe it is notorious that All Antiquity underſtood this Text in *My* Senſe, and not in *His*. One only paſſage he cites out of *Irenæus*, which in the Latin Tranſlation (the original Greek being loſt) has ſome Obſcurity in it. *There is One God the Father*, (ſays Irenæus,) *who is above all, and through all, and in all: Above all, is the Father; through all, is the Word; and in all of us, is the Spirit: For there is One Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.* That this is the True Rendring of the words, (and not, as your Friend tranſlates them, *above all, as Father; through all, as Word; and in all of us, as Spirit;*) appears from the words which follow in the very ſame Chapter; *There is* (ſays he) *One God the Father, who is Above All; and One Word of God, which is Through All:*

Super omnia quidem, Pater;——per omnia autem, Verbum; in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus, &c. *lib.* 5. *c.* 18.

Unus Deus Pater, ſuper Omnes; & unum Verbum Dei, quod per Omnes, &c. *ibid.*

Hic Deus, eſt Pater Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti; & de hoc Paulus Apoſtolus dixit, *Unus Deus Pater, qui ſuper omnes, & per omnia, & in omnibus nobis.* lib. 2. cap. 2.

All: And again; *This God, is the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and of Him it is, that St Paul the Apoſtle declares*, There is One God, even the Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all. And *Athanaſius*, if he did not tranſcribe *Irenæus*'s words as they were in the original Greek, yet he explains them ſufficiently, when he ſays: *One God is preached in the Church, even He who is above all, and through all, and in all; Above all, as he is the Father and Original and Fountain of all; Through all* [not, *as He is the Word*, but] *by his Word; and in all* [not, *as He is the Holy Spirit*, but] *by his Holy Spirit.* I need not add, that the Learned *Biſhop Pearſon* (Expoſ. on Creed, *pag.* 40,) and the Learned *Biſhop Bull* (Defenſ. Sect. 4, c. 1, §. 2,) acknowledge the words, *One God the Father*, in the Text before us, to be meant, not only in *oppoſition* to *Idols* which are *Falſe Gods*, but alſo in *contradiſtinction* from the *Son himſelf* who is *True God:* According to that remarkable paſſage of *Hilary* before-cited; *The Son's being God* (ſaith he) *does not hinder the* Father *from being*

Εἷς θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κηρύττεται, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν· ἐπὶ πάντων μὲν, ὡς πατὴρ, ὡς ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγή· διὰ πάντων δὲ διὰ τοῦ λόγου· ἐν πᾶσι δὲ, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ. Epiſt. ad Serap. 1.

Non enim *Patri* adimitur, quòd *Deus Unus* ſit, quia & Filius Deus ſit; ob id *Unus Deus*, quia ex ſe Deus. *Hil. de Trin. lib.* 4.

The

The One God; *For He is therefore* The One God, *because He is Self-existent God.*

N° 6.

Acts V; 3, 4. ——*to Lie to the Holy Ghost.*——*Thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 66. In the *Answer*, pag. 17.

The plain and obvious meaning of these words, is; that attempting to deceive Inspired Persons, was not barely the Crime of attempting to deceive *Men*, but was in effect an attempting to deceive *God himself*, by whose *Holy Spirit* those Men were inspired. This I have shown at large in my *Scripture-doctrine*; And *Athanasius* himself (as I there observed) interprets the Text in the same manner: *He that lied* (saith he) *to the Holy Ghost, lied to GOD who dwelleth in Men by his Spirit: For where the Spirit of God is, there is God* [himself.] *For hereby, saith the Apostle, we know that GOD dwelleth in us, because he hath given us of His* Spirit. Neither can your learned Friend allege Any Author, from the time the Text was written, till after *Athanasius*'s days, that understood

Ὁ Ψευσάμενος τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, τῷ Θεῷ ἐψεύσατο, τῷ κατοικοῦντι ἐν ἀνθρώποις διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ· ὅπου γάρ ἐστι τὸ πνεύμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκεῖ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός· ἐν τούτῳ γάρ, φησι, γινώσκομεν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν. *De Incarnat. Verbi & contr. Arianos.*

underſtood this Text in any other Senſe. Why then does he ſeek for a *New* Interpretation, unſupported either by Scripture or Antiquity? *If the Term God*, ſays he, *can be applied to the Holy Ghoſt*, [for Proof whereof he refers to *five* Texts, in *not one of which* the Term is ſo applied;] *why ſhould there be ſo much pains taken to prove it to belong to the Father, who is not mentioned in the Context?* I anſwer: It requires no great *Pains* or Force, to underſtand the word, *God*, in *this Text*, as ſignifying *the Father*; becauſe in *All other Texts* the ſame word always ſignifies *the Father*, and in *No other Text* ever ſignifies *the Holy Ghoſt*. The word occurs in the New Teſtament above One Thouſand times, and in all thoſe paſſages, (excepting three or four in which it is applied to *the Son*,) it always ſignifies *the Father*, (as I have ſhown demonſtratively in my *Scripture-doctrine*,) and is in no place applied to the *Holy Ghoſt*. In what Senſe, and with what Propriety of Speech, the *Holy Spirit* may, or may not, be ſtiled *God*, (which your Friend indeavours to intermix in his Argument,) is not here the Queſtion: but whether in fact he *is*, or *is not*, ſo ſtiled in *This* or in any other Text of Scripture. The *Holy Ghoſt*, is the *Holy Spirit of God*; that is to ſay, the *Holy Spirit* of the *Father*: And if the word, *God*, placed abſolutely

lutely as in this Text, ſignified, not *the Father*, but either the *Holy Spirit* or the *whole Three Perſons*; it would follow that the *Holy Spirit of God*, was *the Holy Spirit of Himſelf*; which is a manifeſt Abſurdity. The only *Argument* your Friend urges, why the word, *God*, in this Text, ſhould be meant of *the Holy Ghoſt*, and not of *the Father*; is This very obſcure one: That if the word *God* here ſignified *the Father*, then it would follow that the *Holy Ghoſt* acted *by the Authority* of the *Father*; which ſince the *Apoſtles themſelves* alſo did, it would follow that *They* might have been ſtiled the Objects of the Lie, as well as the *Holy Ghoſt*; the Perſon of the *Spirit* being as little affected with the Lie ſpoken, in compariſon of the Authority affronted in *Him*, as the Perſons of the Apoſtles were affected by it in compariſon of the Authority affronted in *Them*; Neither could a Lie againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, have been ſaid comparatively to be *none againſt Men*, if the Holy Ghoſt were not He who is here ſtiled *God*. I am ſure I have repreſented his Argument more clear and ſtrong, than the Author himſelf repreſented it; and yet at the beſt it is a very obſcure one. The *Strength* of it indeed, is no more than this: If the *Holy Ghoſt* be at all *ſubordinate* to the *Father*, (as the Scripture every where declares he is *ſent* and *given* by *Him*,)

Him,) then He is *nothing at all ſuperiour* to *Men*. The Reader, I truſt, will not ſtand in need of any *Help*, to anſwer this Argument.

N° 7.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 180, and in the *Addenda*, pag. 1. In the *Anſwer*, pag. 19.

GAL. IV, 8. *Ye did Service unto them which by Nature are no Gods*, [τοῖς μὴ φύσ͵ ϑεσι ϑεοῖς, or, as it is in the Alexandrian MS, τοῖς φύσ͵ μὴ ϑεσι ϑεοῖς.]

Of theſe words I propoſed the Two following Expoſitions.

1. *Unto Gods, which have no Being in Nature*, or *which in Nature* [in reality] *have no Being*.

2. *Unto Beings, which by their Nature are not capable of having any divine Power or Authority: Thus*, Acts 19, 26, they be no Gods; *that is, they have none of that Authority and Dominion over you, which you aſcribe to them.*

Of the *latter* of theſe Expoſitions, your Learned Friend takes not the leaſt Notice. I ſuppoſe, he overlooked it, as not being in its proper place, but in the *Addenda*, *pag.* 1; Though he elſewhere takes Notice of ſomething elſe mentioned in That Page.

Againſt

Againſt the *former* of them, He argues as follows:

1. That the Two moſt Antient Verſions, the Vulgar and the Syriac, agree with our received Tranſlation of the words.

2. That in St *Paul*'s ſtyle of Writing, φύσις is no where uſed for Nature in general, or the Syſtem of Natural Beings.

3. That, had φύσις been uſed by him in that general Notion, yet, according to the Analogy of his Style in other places, he would rather have ſaid ἐν φύσῃ, than φύσῃ alone, if he had meant *in Nature* and not *by Nature*.

4. That if φύσῃ had ſignified *in Nature*, yet 'tis probable the Apoſtle would rather have ſaid τοῖς μὴ θεοῖς alone, than τοῖς φύσει μὴ θεοῖς.

5. That φύσει is often uſed by the ſame Apoſtle in other places, to ſignify *by Nature*, not *in Nature*.

All theſe Criticiſms of your Learned Friend, (which I have here fairly ſet before my Reader,) I acknowledge to be Right; And they are, by much, the moſt Scholar-like Obſervations in his Whole Book.

Though therefore the words (notwithſtanding all this) may poſſibly ſignify, *having no Being in Nature*; yet, becauſe *By Nature* is in itſelf the more natural Signification

fication of the word, and alſo more agreeable to the Analogy of *St Paul*'s ſtyle; I acknowledge it to be more probable, that That is the True Rendring.

The Queſtion then is, what is the Meaning of the Phraſe, *By Nature*. Them which *by Nature are no Gods*.

Addenda to Scripture-doctrine, pag. 1.

And This, in my *Latter* Expoſition of the Words, (which your Friend takes no notice of at all,) is as much as to ſay, *They have by their Nature none of that Divine Authority or Dominion over You, which you vainly aſcribe to them.*

Either This is their True Meaning; or elſe the Words, *no Gods by Nature*, muſt ſignify *Beings which in their metaphyſical and eſſential Nature are not Supreme, Self-exiſtent and Independent.*

Now that the Word [φύσις] in Scripture, does not ſignify the *Nature* of things in the *metaphyſical* or *eſſential*, but only in the *vulgar* and *natural*, the *moral* or *political* Senſe of the Word; that is, the true *State* and *Condition* of things, their *Capacities* and *Powers*, their *Circumſtances* and *Qualifications*, the *Reaſon* of things, and ſometimes even *Cuſtoms* only; appears from the Uſe of the ſame Word, 1 *Cor.* 11, 14, *Doth not even* Nature *itſelf teach you, that if a Man hath long Hair, it is a ſhame unto him?* & Rom. 2, 14, *do by* Nature *the things contained*

contained in the Law; & Rom. 1, 26, *That which is against* Nature; & Rom. 2, 27, *Uncircumcision which is by* Nature; & Rom. 11, 24, *which is wild by* Nature; & 2 Pet. 1, 4, *you might be Partakers of the divine* Nature; & Gal. 2, 15, *We who are Jews by* Nature; And *Ephes.* 2, 3, *We were by* Nature *the Children of Wrath:* Not by our original *Nature* or *ESSENCE*; God forbid: But, (as that Text itself expressly explains it,) by *the Then present CIRCUMSTANCES of our Nature*, the *habitual Wickedness and Corruption of Mens Manners* before their Conversion to Christianity. And thus likewise in the present Passage; *Them which by* their *Nature*, (that is, which *in the Nature and Reason and Truth of Things,) are no Gods*; have *no divine, no invisible Authority* or *Dominion* over you; have nothing of That *Nature*, which you vainly ascribe to them; nothing of That *Dominion and Power*, which the Worship you pay them supposes them to have. And This is the True Notion of *Idolatry:* viz. the ascribing to any Being, real or imaginary, such invisible Dominion or Power, and consequently such Worship and Honour, as does not belong to it. For, Worship being nothing else, but the Acknowledgment or Payment of due Honour, correspondent to the True Dominion and Dignity of the Person to whom it is paid; (for

All

All Worſhip or Honour is *Perſonal*, paid not to a *Metaphyſical Subſtance*, but to an *Intelligent Agent*;) it follows manifeſtly, that *ſo far as* Dominion and Power and Authority is aſcribed to any Being, more than it really has; *ſo far* That Being is merely [εἴδωλον,] an *Idol*, a *Nothing in the World*, 1 Cor. 8, 4, a mere *Fiction* of the Imagination. When therefore St *Paul* here charges the * Heathens, (or perhaps, as the Context ſeems to ſuppoſe, corrupt *Jews* and Worſhippers of Angels,) with *doing Service to Them which by Nature are no Gods*; 'tis evident his Argument is not, that the Gods they worſhipped were not abſolutely *Supreme*, *Self-exiſtent*, *Independent* Beings; (for They did not *pretend* This, nor does the Word θεοὶ ever ſignifie any ſuch thing;) but that, neglecting the Worſhip of the True God, they worſhipped Gods who had really nothing of That *Nature* which was aſcribed to them; none of that *Authority or Dominion, either Supreme or Subordinate*, which Theſe Men (like the Church of *Rome* Now in the caſe of their Saint-Worſhip,) imagined them to have. For they were Gods, which either had *no Being at all*; Fictions, and mere imaginary Deities: Or

* If the Apoſtle ſpeaks here concerning *Heathens*, it muſt be obſerved, in order to the right underſtanding of the *Context*, that this Diſcourſe is directed to ſuch New Converts from among the Heathen, as were in danger of being corrupted by *Judaizing* Chriſtians, to think Circumciſion and other Jewiſh Obſervances ſtill neceſſary to Salvation under the Goſpel.

Or elſe, at beſt, they were [δαιμόνια] Beings which *in reality* were not of *That Nature* which their Worſhippers pretended them to be, indued or capable of being indued with *divine inviſible Dominion and Authority* over Men. Thus *Jer.* 5, 7, *Them that are no Gods*; and *Acts* 19, 26, *They be no Gods*; that is, have not and cannot have any of That divine Authority and Dominion over you, which you fooliſhly and wickedly aſcribe to them.

But now, *Chriſt* is *by Nature* Truly *God*; (as *Truly*, as *Man* is *by Nature* Truly *Man*;) that is, he is *God*, not Self-exiſtent and Unoriginate; (for That is peculiar to the *Father*, and abſolutely incommunicable;) but he is *God*, as having, by *that Nature* which he derives from the Father, *True divine Power and Dominion over all things both in Heaven and Earth*, in ſubordination to Him who alone is abſolutely [ὁ παντοκράτωρ] of Himſelf Supreme over All.

N° 8.

HEB. III; 3, 4, 5, 6. *For this Perſon* [viz. Chriſt] *was counted worthy of more Glory than Moſes, inaſmuch as He who hath builded the Houſe, hath more Honour than the Houſe.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 264. In the *Anſwer*, pag. 23.

For every Houſe is builded by ſome one; But He that built all things, is God.
And Moſes verily was faithful in all his Houſe as a Servant,——
But Chriſt, as a Son over his own Houſe, &c.

The true Meaning of theſe words, I think, is This: *Moſes* was faithful as a *Servant*, in *another Man*'s Houſe; *Chriſt*, as a *Son* in his *own* Houſe, of his *own* Building; And the Supreme *Houſholder* [the *Pater-familiâs*] or *Father* over all, is GOD. It is a like Form of ſpeaking, to that in 1 *Cor.* 11, 3, *The Head of every* Man, *is* Chriſt; *and the Head of the* Woman, *is the* Man; *and the Head of* Chriſt, *is* GOD. And *Ver.* 12, *but All things, of* GOD.

Your Friend is deſirous to find another Interpretation of this paſſage; by which he would indeavour to underſtand the word, *God*, as ſpoken here of *Chriſt*. But what he ſays upon this occaſion, is ſo obſcure and dark; and ſo ſpoils the Elegancy of the Compariſon the Apoſtle makes, between *Moſes*'s Faithfulneſs as a *Servant*, and *Chriſt*'s as a *Son*; and ſeems ſo little ſatisfactory, even to Himſelf; that I need only deſire the Reader to compare our Two Explications together, and follow That which ſhall ſeem to him moſt reaſonable.

No

N° 9.

2 PET. I, 1. *The Righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 289. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 24.

I do acknowledge (and I observed it before in my *Scripture-doctrine*,) that the words [δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,] may, in true grammatical Construction, equally be rendred, either, *The Righteousness of our God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ*, or, *The Righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.* So that, if one Man thinks the word, *God*, is here meant of *the Father*, and another thinks that it is rather applied in this place to *the Son*; Neither of their Opinions can be *demonstrably* disproved.

It seems to *Me*, to be meant of *the Father*; and *your Friend* thinks, on the contrary, it belongs to *the Son.* Only he did not do well, to set down his own Translation *only*, which determines the Sense according to *his* Explication; whereby an *English* Reader may be deceived, so as to think there is no Ambiguity in the Original; whereas indeed the Original leaves it wholly Ambiguous, and the *English* Translation in our Bibles determines it according to *my* Explication.

My Reaſons for underſtanding it of *the Father*, are: *Firſt*, becauſe the word, *God*, throughout the New Teſtament, generally ſignifies *the Father*, and therefore moſt probably does ſo in this place likewiſe. And *Secondly*, becauſe in the *very next Verſe*, the ſame words are repeated in ſuch a Conſtruction, as determines the Senſe *neceſſarily* without Any Ambiguity; [Ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν,] *The Knowledge of God, and of Jeſus our Lord.* Now ſince, in the *ſecond Verſe*, theſe words, [*The Knowledge of God, and of Jeſus our Lord,*] are in the Original placed in ſuch a Conſtruction, as of *neceſſity* to ſignify *God the Father* in Contradiſtinction to *Jeſus our Lord*; 'tis probable that, in the *firſt Verſe* likewiſe, thoſe words, [*The Righteouſneſs of God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt,*] though placed *ambiguouſly* in the Original, yet were intended in the ſame manner to ſignify *God the Father*, in Contradiſtinction to *Jeſus our Saviour.*

Your Friend's Reaſons for underſtanding this Text the other way, are: *Firſt*, that the words [Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρος] *our Lord and Saviour*, are often uſed conjunctly of *Chriſt.* But This is a very *different* Expreſſion: For, *our Lord and Saviour*, is always meant of *Chriſt*, and never of the *Father*; But on the contrary, *God our Saviour*, is always ſpoken of the *Father*, and never

never of *Christ*: See 1 Tim. 1, 1, *The Commandment of* God our Saviour, *and the Lord Jesus Christ*; and Tit. 3; 4, 6, *The Love of* God our Saviour,—*which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.* 'Tis most probable therefore, that in the present Text likewise, both *God* and *our Saviour Jesus Christ* being mentioned, it was intended to be understood distinctly both of the *Father* and of *Christ*. *Secondly*, Your Friend alleges, that those other the like words, *Tit.* 2, 13, [τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *The Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*,] though he acknowledges them to seem, in our *English* Translation, against him; yet were understood by *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Gregory Nyssen*, as if the Apostle had said, *Our Great God and Saviour Jesus Christ*: And This Sense he inclines to think the most probable, because the word [ἐπιφάνεια, *The Appearing of &c.*] is never used elsewhere in the New Testament, but of *Christ*; the *Father* being never said to *Appear*. But This reason, I think, is by no means sufficient: For, *Christ* being the *Image of the Invisible God*; these words, *the glorious Appearing* (or, *the Appearing of the Glory*) *of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*, (as our *English* Translators rightly render the Text,) very naturally signify, the *Appearing of the Great God By our Sa-*

viour Jesus Christ; according to the Analogy of those other Scripture-expressions, that *God shall judge the World by Jesus Christ*, and that Christ shall *come in the Glory of his Father*, that is, *the Glory of his Father shall appear invested in Him.* Besides; the words, [τῦ μεγαλ^υ Θεῦ, *The Great God*,] being in the *Old Testament* the Character of the *Father*; *Deut.* 10, 17; 2 *Sam.* 7, 22; 2 *Chr.* 2, 5; *Nehem.* 9, 32; *Job* 36, 26: *Ps.* 86, 10; *Jer.* 32, 18; and in the *New Testament* never used of *Christ*, but of the *Father* only, *Rev.* 19, 17; 'tis therefore very reasonable that they should here also be so understood. Especially, considering the *general Style* of St *Paul*: Who, having laid it down as a *Foundation*, 1 *Cor.* 8, 6, that *to Us there is but One GOD, the Father*; *and One LORD, Jesus Christ*: and *Eph.* 4; 5, 6, *One LORD, One GOD and Father of all*: does so constantly and uniformly keep to this Rule of expression through his whole Writings, that (in all * *uncontested* places) he never fails to confine the word, *God*, to the *Father*, and (except in Citations out of the *Old Testament*,) the word, *Lord*, to *Christ*; At least, whenever *Both* are mentioned together. Besides: This *whole* passage,

* For in *Rom.* 9, 5, it is uncertain whether the word, *God*, was originally in the Text; and, if it was, whether it be not there spoken of the *Father*. In 1 *Tim.* 3, 16, instead of the word, *God*; all the Old Versions have it [qui *or* quod] *Which*, or *He which*: And all the Antient Fathers, though the Copies of many of them have it now in the Text itself, [Θεὸς, *God*;]

passage, [*The* GRACE *of* GOD——*hath* APPEARED *to all Men*;——*looking for the glorious* APPEARING *of the* GREAT GOD, *and our Saviour* JESUS CHRIST;] is exactly parallel to, and explained by, That other Passage in the next Chapter, *Tit.* 3; 4, 6, [*The Kindness and* LOVE *of* GOD *our Saviour*, (viz. of the Father,) *toward Man* APPEARED;——*which* HE *shed on us*——*through* JESUS CHRIST *our Saviour*; *that, being justified by his* GRACE, &c.] But before I leave this Text, 'tis reasonable that I acquaint the Reader with an Argument in favour of your Friend's Interpretation, much stronger than any that he has brought for himself. It may be alleged; if the *Great God* signifies here *the Father*, and not *Christ*; that then St *Paul* would have said, τῦ μεγάλυ θεῦ καὶ τῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησῦ χριστῦ, and not simply τῦ μεγάλυ θεῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησῦ χριστῦ. But to This, the true Answer is; that in Nouns Characteristical and Equivalent (as it were) to Proper Names, the Article

yet from the Tenour of their Comments upon it, and from their never citing it in the *Arian* Controversy, it appears they read it, [qui *or* quod,] *Which*, or *He which*; 'till the time of *Macedonius* under the Emperour *Anastasius*, in the Beginning of the Sixth Century. Of the Two passages cited to the contrary by the learned Dr *Mills* in his Appendix, *That* from *Justin Martyr* does not prove he did, but rather that he did not, read it [θεὸς] *God*; and *That* from *Athanasius*, is out of a Book acknowledged to be spurious. And therefore these Two Texts, [1 *Tim.* 3, 16, and *Rom.* 9, 5,] are by your Friend himself *omitted* in his Collection. Lastly, *Heb.* 1, 8, is only a Citation out of the 45th *Psalm*, wherein the word אלהים is rendred θεὸς *God*, and is there spoken of a person, whom GOD, even *His God, had anointed.*

ticle is very frequently left out. Thus θεὸς is often used to signify the same as ὁ θεὸς, κύριος as ὁ κύριος, σωτὴρ as ὁ σωτήρ; Though on the contrary ὁ θεὸς is never used for θεὸς, ὁ κύριος for κύριος, nor ὁ σωτὴρ for σωτὴρ in general: The reason whereof, is, in the Nature of the Language, evident enough. Now in like manner as, supposing *St Paul* had said, τῷ μεγάλῳ θεῷ καὶ κυρίῳ (that is, τῷ κυρίῳ) ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ, every Body would have understood θεῷ to belong to the *Father*, and κυρίῳ to *Christ*; so, when he says τῷ μεγάλῳ θεῷ καὶ σωτῆρι (that is, τῷ σωτῆρι) ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ, his meaning is still evidently the same. Thus *Luke* 2, 11, *Unto you is born this day* (σωτὴρ) *a Saviour:* It is put as signifying the same with ὁ σωτὴρ, and should accordingly have been translated, *The Saviour*, (the expected or promised Saviour,) *which is Christ the Lord.* Again, *Phil.* 3, 20, *From whence also we look for* [σωτῆρα, here our Translators rightly render it as if it had been τὸν σωτῆρα] *The Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.* In like manner, 1 *Tim.* 1, 1, the words which we read, κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν & κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, *by the commandment of God our Saviour and the Lord Jesus Christ*, are in some Manuscripts, κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ (that is, τοῦ θεοῦ) πατρὸς, καὶ σωτῆρος (that is, τοῦ σωτῆρος) ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ,

χριστοῦ, *by the commandment of God the Father and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

N° 10.

MATT. XIX, 17. *There is None Good, but One, that is God.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 340, & N° 1. In the *Answer, pag.* 26.

Concerning This Text I have already discourſed at large above, *N°* 1. I ſhall here only take Notice of what your Friend has added New in this place.

I had cited a paſſage of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, where he Paraphraſes the words [*One, that is God,*] by theſe which follow, [ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, *My Father which is in Heaven.*] Your Friend alleges out of him Another paſſage, wherein he ſays, *The One only Good God is the Son in the Father.* I leave the Reader to compare the Two paſſages together, and draw from thence the beſt Inferences he can. Only let him conſider, that One of them is a direct Expoſition of the Text itſelf; the other, is only a Rhetorical Sentence of the Author.

In like manner, out of *Athanaſius*, I cited a paſſage, wherein, by way of Expoſition upon this very Text, he ſays, [*The Son, when he came into the World, glorified not himſelf, but his FATHER; ſaying to a cer-*

See *Scripture-doctrine, pag.* 52.

a certain Person that came to him, Why calleſt thou Me, Good? There is None Good, but One, that is God.] Your Friend refers to Other paſſages of the ſame Author, where he ſays *the Son is not excluded*, but *is In the One and Only God.* In what Senſe This may well be true, and yet the ſame Author's Comment upon the Text ſtill hold good and conſiſtent, that the *One God* there mentioned by our Saviour, is *the Father*; an intelligent Reader will eaſily apprehend. If not; then What does the Authority alleged, amount to?

Novatian, ſpeaking of *the Father*, has theſe words; *Whom alone our Lord juſtly pronounces to be Good.* Your Friend indeavours to find in the ſame Author ſome other paſſage, which, by a remote Metaphyſical and Scholaſtick conſequence, ſuch as *Novatian* never thought of, may ſeem to caſt ſome obſcurity upon this plain paſſage. But *Novatian* ſpoke every where very uniformly; And his Whole Book was written profeſſedly upon This Subject; And the Deſign of it throughout, is to maintain the very thing I am contending for: Which he has done with great Accuracy, againſt the Errours in Both Extremes: So that his Book is highly worth the peruſal of all Learned Men.

And Theſe are All the *Authorities*, your learned Friend here refers to.

As

As to the *Text itself*, the True Meaning of it seems to Me to be this: That in the like Sense as *God the Father* is in other places of Scripture declared to be the *One and Only God*, he is in this place declared to be also the *One and Only Good*. That is to say: As *God the Father* is, by way of Eminence, the *One and Only God*, because He Alone has [αὐτοθεότητα] *Divinity absolutely of Himself, Supreme, Unoriginate, and not derived from Any*; (as *Origen* learnedly and at large argues in the place before-cited; *See above, pag.* 65.) and yet *Christ* is also *True God*, because he has *True Divinity derived to him from the Father*; whereas all *False Gods*, are *no Gods* at all: So *God the Father* is likewise, by way of Eminence, the *One and Only Good*, because He Alone is [αὐτοαγαθὸν] the *original underived Fountain of Goodness*; and yet *Christ* also is *Truly Good*, by having the *Father's Goodness communicated to him without Measure*; whereas *False Gods*, have neither Any Dominion, nor Any *Goodness* at all.

To This, your Friend answers: That *Self-originated and Begotten, do not appear to be essential, but personal Characters; inferring, not a difference of Substance, but a different manner of having their Subsistence; the Son receiving it by Generation from the Father,* pag. 27.

Father, which denominates him Begotten; the Father having it without receiving it from any other, which names him Self-originated.

I reply: His affirming *Self-originated* and *Begotten*, to be, not *eſſential*, but *perſonal* Characters; is affirming, in other Words, that they are, not *eſſential*, but *eſſential* Characters. For What is a *perſonal Character*, but a Character which diſtinguiſhes *That particular Perſon* from *all other Perſons?* and What is This, but the *Eſſence* of That Perſon? If we know any thing of the *Eſſence* of God, the firſt and of all others the *moſt eſſential* Character of him, is his being *Self-exiſtent or Unoriginated.* The *Subſtance* of the Son, whatever the *Nature* of it be in other reſpects, yet is certainly *derived from the Father*; otherwiſe, the Son being Self-exiſtent as well as the Father, it would follow, that Not *the Perſon of the Son*, (that is, Not *the Son himſelf,*) but the *Perſonality only* of the Son was *begotten of the Father:* Which is unintelligible Metaphyſicks, and without any Foundation in Scripture. However, your Friend, by allowing the *Son* to be *Begotten*, and the Father alone to be *Self-originated* or (to ſpeak more properly) *Unoriginated*; clearly grants *All* that I contend for: Though, at the ſame time, by darkning it with

with other more obſcure and metaphyſical Expreſſions, he would ſeem to deny it.

N° 11.

ROM. XI, 36. *Of him, and through him, and to him are all things.*

In the Scripture-doctrine, N° 372.

The Meaning (I think) is: *From* Him [*viz.* from the Father] all things derive their Being, *by* Him all things are preſerved and governed, *to* his Glory all things ſhall terminate.

In the Anſwer, pag. 27.

Your Learned Friend paraphraſes the Words thus: *Of him, as HE is Father; through him, as HE is Son; to him (or rather, in him, for ſo the Particle εἰς is frequently uſed,) as HE is the Holy Ghoſt.*

Had he here intended to expreſs the *Sabellian* Notion, which in the Whole amounts to the very ſame with *Socinianiſm*; denying the Son and Holy Ghoſt to be any thing more than mere empty Names; I know not how it could poſſibly have been declared in more full and expreſſive Words.

The Paſſage he cites out of *Novatian*, is not *for* him, but directly *againſt* him. *All things* (ſays *Novatian*, ſpeaking of *God the Father,*) *are* OF *Him, becauſe they exiſt by his*

his Command, and are THROUGH *Him, becauſe they are* [verbo ejus digeſta] *put in order by His Word*; (Not, as your Friend would have it, *by Him as HE is the Word.)*

I obſerve one thing further upon This Head. Your Friend is very fond of confounding All Language. In the firſt Text he quotes, he will have [εἷς] to ſignify *One Thing*, inſtead of *One Perſon*. And here he would have [εἰς αὐτὸν] to ſignify, *in Him*, inſtead of, *to Him*: The Particle, he ſays, being Frequently ſo uſed. But there is no ſuch thing in the World, as putting *one Word*, in this manner, for *another*: And indeed it is impoſſible there ſhould; For, at that rate, no Language would have any Signification. Some Grammarians indeed give Inſtances of *one Word's* ſeeming to be put for *another*; But the Inſtances they allege, are always either Corruptions of the Copies, or elſe their own Miſtakes. There are ſome places in the New Teſtament, where our Tranſlators render [εἰς αὐτὸν] *in him*; But where-ever they do ſo, 'tis becauſe they miſtake the Senſe. Thus 1 *Cor.* 8, 6, *To us there is but One God, the Father; of whom are all things, and We In him*: In the Greek it is [εἰς αὐτὸν,] *and we To him*: That is, *To* or *For his Glory*; Or, (as the Learned Mr *Mede* paraphraſes it,) *to whom as Supreme we are*

Diſcourſe on 2 Pet. 2, 1.

to

to direct all our Services. The like vulgar Error, with regard to the Particle [*in*] in the *Latin* Language, I have refuted in my *Annotations upon Cæsars Commentaries, ad lib.* 4. *de Bello Gallico, pag.* 76, *lin.* 12. Sometimes indeed one and the same Word has indifferently *two* or *more* significations; and then it may (according as the Sense requires) be understood in *Any* of those Significations. Thus the Word [ἐν] in the New Testament, according to the Genius of the *Hebrew* and *Hellenistical* Stile, signifies indifferently *In* or *By.* But there is no such thing in any Language, as putting one Word for another; And therefore εἰς αὐτὸν, (the Word εἰς having but one signification,) can be rendred no otherwise than *To Him.*

N° 12.

EPHES. IV, 6. *One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 382 *. In the *Answer, pag.* 28.

This (he says) is understood of the *Trinity*, by *Irenæus*. If it were so, *Irenæus*'s Authority would scarce be sufficient to prove, that *One God and Father of all* signified the *Trinity.* But what *Irenæus* meant in the place referr'd to, I have shown above,

pag.

pag. 71. I think I need not add, that *Biſhop Pearſon (Expoſ. on the Creed, pag.* 40,) and *Biſhop Bull* (Defenſ. Sect. 4, cap. 1, §. 2,) underſtand this Text of *God the Father* only. The words of the Apoſtle are very expreſs, without a Comment: *There is—One Spirit,—One Lord,—One God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in you all.*

N° 13.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 395. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 28.

TIT. II, 13. *The glorious appearing of the Great God,* [or, *the appearing of the Glory of the Great God*;] *and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*

Here your Friend refers only to what he had ſaid before upon this Text, under the Head (*N°* 9;) Under which Head, *I* alſo have at large ſpoken of it above, *pag.* 85.

N° 14.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 410. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 28. See alſo my *Letter to Dr* Wells, *pag* 73.

1 JOHN V, 20, 21. *This is the True God, and Eternal Life—Keep yourſelves from Idols.*

Your Learned Friend reads the whole Paſſage thus: *The Son of God is come, and hath*

hath given us an Understanding that we may know Him that is True, [viz. the Son of God;] *And we are in Him that is True, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This* [viz. Jesus Christ] *is the True God and Eternal Life: Little Children, keep yourselves from Idols.*

I read and understand the Text thus: *The Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding*, [has enlightened the Eyes of our Understanding, as 'tis *Eph.* 1, 18,] *that we may know the True God*, [viz. that we may know and acknowledge the Father revealed by the Son;] *And we are in Him that is True*, [viz. in That True God,] *by* (or, *through*) *his Son Jesus Christ. This is the True God, and Eternal Life*, [viz. This God, whom the Son has given us an Understanding to know, is the True God; and to know and acknowledge him, and to be In him in (*or* by) his Son, this is eternal Life: Ἑτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, καὶ (αὕτη) ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος: This is the True God, and This the Way that leads to him; This is the true Worship of God, by his Son, unto eternal Life:] *Little Children, keep yourselves from Idols*, [from Idol-Worship.]

The Reasons for *each* of these Interpretations, are as follows.

Your Friend alleges in the firſt place, that the *general Deſign of the Epiſtle*, is not to teach the Truth and Exiſtence of the *One only God*, in oppoſition to Idols; but to incourage Believers to continue in the Faith of the *Son of God*, by aſſuring them that they had *eternal Life* by virtue of That Faith. And from hence he ſuppoſes the Apoſtle to conclude, that *the Son of God, Jeſus Chriſt, is Himſelf the True God, and the only way to Eternal Life, or rather Eternal Life itſelf*; and that therefore Men ought to keep themſelves from *Idols*, or from *All Means of approaching God, beſides this Divine Perſon.*

But now This Argument proves juſt the contrary to what your Friend intended. For if the Deſign of this Epiſtle be (as indeed it is,) to incourage Believers to continue in the Faith of *the Son God*, as that wherein their *Eternal Life* conſiſts; and to warn them to keep from *Idols*, that is, from *All other means of approaching God*, but through *this divine Perſon*: Does it not from hence plainly appear, that the Apoſtle, in his Concluſion, means to declare *Chriſt* to be *the Way, the Truth and the Life*, the only *Means of approaching God*, that is, not of approaching *himſelf*, but of approaching *his Father*, who is here ſtiled *The True God*, whom *the Son of God has given*

given us an Understanding to know, and, by giving us That Understanding, is our *Eternal Life*.

As the *Design* of the *Gospel*, is to show, that *This is Life Eternal, to know the Only True God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent*, Joh. 17, 3; and again, *Joh.* 20, 31, *These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have Life through his Name:* So the *Design* of this *Epistle* is to show, that our Eternal Life consists, in believing Jesus to be the *SON of God*, and in being brought by him to the knowledge and acknowledgment of the *True God* in opposition to all Idols; and not in believing him [the *Son of the True God*,] to be himself that very same individual *True God* [that very same Person] whose *Son* he is. *Verse the* 5*th* of this Chapter; *Who is he that overcometh the World, but he that believeth that Jesus is the SON of God?* And *Ver.* 11, 12, 13, *This is the record, that God hath given to us Eternal Life; and this Life is in his SON: He that hath the Son, hath Life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not Life: These things have I written unto you that believe on the Name of the SON of God; that ye may know that ye have Eternal Life, and that ye may believe on the Name of the SON of God.*

In the next place, your Friend alleges, that the word [ἀληθινὸς, and ὁ ἀληθινὸς,] *He that is True*, is in St *John*'s Writings *ſeldom* applied to *the Father*; in this firſt Epiſtle, *never* applied to *the Father*; but, in all his Writings, *frequently* applied to *the Son*: As *Rev.* 3, 7, *Theſe things ſaith He that is True*; Rev. 3, 14, *Theſe things ſaith the Faithful and True Witneſs*; & Rev. 19, 11, *He that ſat upon the white Horſe, was called Faithful and True*; as if, *True*, were a Name or Attribute more particularly the Son's. And from hence he infers, that therefore probably in the preſent paſſage alſo, the words, *Him that is True*, and, *in Him that is True*, and, *the True God*, are all ſpoken of *the Son:* Eſpecially ſince, in the Conſtruction of the words, [*We are in Him that is True, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt,*] 'tis plain *(he ſays)* that the Terms, *in Him that is True*, are explained by, *in his Son*; ſo that no doubt *(he ſays)* can be made, but that the word *True* belongs here to Chriſt; and therefore 'tis a ſtrong Probability, that they are meant of Him alſo in the foregoing words, *that we may know Him that is True.*

Now All this (which I have repreſented in its full force) is very plauſible to an Unlearned Reader, and (I believe) very ſincere

ſincere (as the whole Book ſeems to be) in the Writer himſelf. But yet Nothing is more impoſſible, than This his Interpretation. For it all depends upon *Two* very great Errours: *One*, an Errour in the reading of the Original; The *Other*, a Miſtake in the *Engliſh* Tranſlation. The *Firſt*, is an Errour in the reading of the Original: For if your Friend had (as it was reaſonable he ſhould have done,) conſulted *Dr Mills*; he would have found that the Moſt and Beſt Manuſcripts have it, [ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν,] *that we may know* [not, *him that is True*, but] *the True GOD.* Now though your Friend's Obſervation is very right, that [ἀληθινὸς, or ὁ ἀληθινὸς, *he that is True*,] when uſed alone, as *Rev.* 19, 11, always ſignifies *the Son*, becauſe it is of the ſame import with [ὁ ἀληθινὸς μάρτυς] *the Faithful and True Witneſs*, Rev. 3, 14: yet, on the contrary, when it is joined with [Θεὸς] *God*, it *always* ſignifies *the Father*, and *never* the Son: *Joh.* 17, 3, *That they might know Thee the Only* True God [ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν,] *and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*; And 1 *Th.* 1, 9, *To ſerve the Living and* True God, [Θεῷ ἀληθινῷ,] *and to wait for His Son from Heaven.* The firſt part therefore of the Text before us, according to the true Reading, ſtands thus: *The Son of God is come, and*

hath given us an Underſtanding [ἵνα γινώσκωμεν καὶ ἀληθινὸν θεὸν] *that we may know the True God,* [καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ] *and we are in That True God*; or, *in the True One*; ſo the word ought to be rendred, and not (as we tranſlate it,) *in Him that is True:* For the meaning is not, [*in Verace,*] in Him that *ſpeaketh the Truth*; but, [*in Vero,*] in Him that *Is the True One. Baſil,* in his Fourth Book againſt *Eunomius,* reads the Text thus; ἵνα γινώσκωμεν καὶ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ, *that we may know the Only True God, and we are in his True Son Jeſus Chriſt*; Which Reading, though corrupt, yet confirms the Authority of thoſe Manuſcripts, which, in the former part of the Text, put in the word Θεὸν. The *Other* Errour your Friend is guilty of, is his being miſ-led by a Miſtake in the *Engliſh* Tranſlation of the following words, [καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ·] which our Tranſlators, following *Beza* too implicitly, render thus, *We are in Him that is True,* even *in his Son Jeſus Chriſt.* In which words (ſays your Friend) " it is plain that the Terms, *in Him that is* " *True,* are explained by, *in his Son*; ſo " that no doubt can be made, but that " the word *True* belongs to Chriſt ". But if this were ſo; and the words, *in Him that*

is

is True, were meant of Chriſt; Whom then would the word, *His*, refer to, in the following Period, *even in HIS Son Jeſus Chriſt?* Is not, *HIS Son*, as much as to ſay, *the Son* [τῦ ἀληθινῦ] *of That True One?* and if then by That *True One* was meant *Chriſt*, would not This be to ſay that *Jeſus Chriſt* was the *Son* of *Himſelf?* Or, does the word, *His*, refer to ſome very remote Antecedent? The True Rendring therefore plainly is; *that we may know the True God, and we are In That True God BY his Son Jeſus Chriſt:* That is; Chriſt has not only given us an Underſtanding to *know* and acknowledge the True God, but has moreover brought us to a ſtill nearer Union and Communion with him, even ſo as to be *In Him:* Thus *ch.* 4, 15, *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in Him, and He in God*; And *Joh.* 17, 21, *Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee, that They alſo may be one in Us.* The Deſign of the Apoſtle is not to *prove* (as your Friend ſuppoſes,) that we *Are in Chriſt*; but to *infer* from *thence*, (*That* being the *Premiſe*, not the *Concluſion* of his Argument,) that in like manner as Thoſe who are in the *World*, (*ver.* 19,) are thereby [ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ] *in the Evil One*, and, becauſe they have not *the Son*, therefore neither have they *the Father*, *ch.* 2, 23; ſo We, on the contrary, who *Are in Chriſt*, are

thereby Consequently [ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ] *in the True God*, and *Know ourselves to be of God* (*ch.* 5, 19,) becauſe by Chriſt we have the *Knowledge of the True God* (*ver.* 20,) and are *in the True God* by *his Son Jeſus Chriſt*. We *have the Father* (ch. 2, 23,) or are *in the Father*, ver. 24. Thus [εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι,] to *be In the Spirit*: And [εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι ακαθαρτῷ] to *be in an unclean Spirit*, ſignifies the ſame as [ἔχειν] to *have an unclean Spirit*. We are *in the True God* then, *BY his Son Jeſus Chriſt*: So the Præpoſition [ἐν] ſignifies in the Hebrew Idiom. Thus *ver.* 11th of this very Chapter; *This is the Record, that God hath given to us Eternal Life, and This Life* is *IN* (that is, *By* or *Through*) *his Son*. Again, *ver.* 5, *This is He that came by Water* [δι' ὕδατος] *and Blood*; *not by Water* [ἐκ ΕΝ τῷ ὕδατι] *only, but by Water and Blood*. Or, the words may be rendred thus; *We are In That True God, by being IN his Son Jeſus Chriſt*: Taking the Præpoſition in its uſual Signification; As *ch.* 2, 24, *Ye ſhall continue In the Son and In the Father*. But the more natural rendring of the words before us, is (as I ſaid,) *We are in That True God, BY his Son Jeſus Chriſt*. For ſuppoſe the Apoſtle had ſaid in this place, according to his uſual Style, ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, [ᾧ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν ἡμῖν,] ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ, it would then have been manifeſtly

manifeſtly impoſſible to render the latter Præpoſition [ἐν,] otherwiſe than, *B T. We are in the True God*, [and He in Us,] *By his Son Jeſus Chriſt.* Laſtly, if any one ſhall allege, that the Præpoſition [ἐν,] repeated (as in this place) *twice together* in the ſame Sentence, cannot ſo vary, as in the one part to be rendred, *in*, and in the other, *by*; the following undeniable Inſtances will convince him of the contrary: *Acts* 7, 44, ἐν τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, *was* with (*or* among) *our Fathers* in *the Wilderneſs:* Rom. 1, 9, ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, with *my Spirit*, in *the Goſpel:* Gal. 2, 20, ἐν σαρκὶ, ἐν πίστει, in *the Fleſh*, by *the Faith:* Epheſ. 1, 3, ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν χριστῷ, with *all Bleſſings* in *Heavenly places* in *Chriſt:* Epheſ. 2, 6, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν χριστῷ, in *Heavenly places* in [*with* or *by*] *Chriſt:* Epheſ. 3, 21, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν χριστῷ, in *the Church* by *Chriſt:* 2 Th. 1, 4, ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, in [*concerning*] *you* in *the Churches:* 1 Joh, 4, 9, ἐν τούτῳ—ἐν ἡμῖν, in *This*—towards *us*. And thus likewiſe in the preſent Paſſage, ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, in *the True One* by *his Son.*

In the third place, your Friend alleges that *Irenæus*, and ſome other of the Ancients, ſtiled Chriſt [*Verus Deus*] *True God*, or, as the better Copies of *Irenæus* generally have

have it, [*Verè Deus,*] *Truly God*; And that therefore *Christ* is moſt probably meant in this Text by the Words, *This is the True God.*

I anſwer: *Irenæus* very juſtly ſtiles Chriſt *True God* and *Truly God*; meaning thereby, (as I have above ſhown at large, *pag.* 11,) not *Self-exiſtent*, *Independent*, *Underived Divinity*; but (as he *expreſsly explains* himſelf in the * Book your Friend ſo often refers to,) that Chriſt is *Truly God*, by having *RECEIVED from his Father* True Divinity and *Dominion over the whole Creation*; whereas *False Gods* have no Divinity or Dominion at all. But in what Senſe ſoever *Christ* is by *Irenæus* affirmed to be, and in reality is, *True God*; yet *in This Text* 'tis not He, that is ſpoken of by that Name. For the preceding Word, *He that is True*, (to which your Friend thinks nothing but *Apparent Prejudice* can hinder a Man from referring the following Words, *This is the True God*;) I ſay, the preceding Word, *He that is True*, being ſpoken (as I have now ſhown) not of the *Son*, (as your Friend ſuppoſes,) but of the *Father*; it follows plainly that the next Words, *This is the True God*, are meant alſo, not of the *Son*, but of the *Father.* For it cannot be, but the ſame *Perſon* muſt be ſpoken of throughout; *that we may know the TRUE GOD, and we are in Him that is TRUE*

* See *Iren. lib.* 3. *cap.* 6. throughout.

[in

[in That TRUE GOD] *by* (or *through*) *His Son Jesus Christ, This is the TRUE GOD &c.* The word, [οὗτος, *This*,] refers back, as is most natural and usual, not to the *last* word *in Order*, but to the *last and principal* in *Sense*, that which was uppermost in the Writers Thoughts, and chiefly aimed at in the Whole Discourse. Had St *John* intended to affirm, what your Friend supposes; he would not have said, οὗτος ἐστὶν, but Ἐστι δὲ οὗτος, or ἐστι δὴ καὶ οὗτος &c. Neither would he have said, οὗτος ἐστιν [ὁ] ἀληθινος θεὸς; for That would have been affirming the Person of the Son to be the very Person of the Father beforementioned; but he would have said, οὗτός ἐστιν, or ἐστι δὴ καὶ οὗτος, Ἀληθινὸς θεός. For, as I before observed, though Θεὸς is often the same as ὁ θεὸς, yet, on the contrary, ὁ θεὸς is never by Any Writers put for θεός: As the Learned well understand. It ought also to weigh somewhat with your Friend, that None of the Writers of the Three First Centuries allege these words, *This is the True God*, as spoken of *Christ*.

Lastly, your Friend urges in the last place, that "the following part of the "Context, *Eternal Life*, is another Argu- "ment that the Person of Jesus Christ is un- "derstood by the *True God:* For it does not "appear,

" appear, (ſays he,) that thoſe Terms [viz. " *eternal Life*] are ſpoken of any other " Perſon in the whole Epiſtle, but of " the Son only; as *ch.* I, 2; *ch.* V, " 11, 12, 13. If then the Son be " the *eternal Life*; the *True God*, *WHO* " *IS* this *eternal Life*, muſt be the Son " alſo ".

That the Terms, *eternal Life*, are indeed in this whole Epiſtle applied only to *the Son*, is very true; but This proves, not what your Friend ſuppoſes, but the contrary. For St *John* does not ſay, that *The True God* IS *eternal Life*; but he Therefore calls the *Son eternal Life*, becauſe it is *He* that bringeth us *to the True God.* He is the *Way*, the *Truth*, and the *Life*; and is ſo, *by giving us an Underſtanding* (as this very Text expreſſes it) *that we may know the True God.* The Meaning therefore of theſe laſt Words [*This is the True God and eternal Life*,] is, as I before ſaid; This God, whom the Son has given us an Underſtanding to know, is the True God; and to know and acknowledge him, and to be In him in (*or* by) his Son, This is eternal Life: Ἕτος, ἔστιν ὁ ἀληθινος θεὸς, καὶ (αὐτη) ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος: This is the True God, and This the Way that leads to him: This is, *having the Father and the Son*, 1 *John*, 2; 22, 23; and 2 *John*, 9. This is the True Religion, the Worſhip of this True God by and

and through his Son Jesus Christ: *Little Children, keep your selves from Idols*; Beware of Idol-worship.

Your Friend wishes some Instances had been given, in which the *True God* is used for *the True Religion.* I answer: By the same Figure that *Idols* or *False Gods*, in the very next Words, signifie the *Worship of False Gods*, which is *False Religion*; by the very same figure of speaking here, *the True God* signifies the *Worship of the True God*, which is *True Religion.* 'Tis in *Neither* Case, a strict *Translation*; but in *Both*, a true *Paraphrase.*

N° 15.

JUDE 4. *Denying the Only Lord God* [μόνον Δεσπότην θεὸν, God the only Supreme Governour,] *and* (denying) *our Lord Jesus Christ.* (℔ In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 15 & 411. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 36.

The Hereticks the Apostle here speaks of, are the same that St *John* mentions, 1 *John* 2; 22, 23, *Who is a Liar*, [Gr. ὁ ψευστης, The Liar, *viz.* Antichrist,] *but he that Denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is Antichrist, that denieth THE FATHER and THE*

THE SON : Whoſoever Denieth THE SON, the ſame hath not THE FATHER.

Some Copiers of St *Judes* Epiſtle, not underſtanding This Senſe of the Words, which St *John* ſo clearly explains ; and not apprehending how all *Deniers of the Son*, are Conſequently charged as being *Deniers of the Father* alſo ; have read St *Judes* Words thus : Ⓢ μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, or, Ⓢ μόνον θεὸν καὶ δεσπότην τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν *denying our Only Maſter and Lord, Jeſus Chriſt* ; or, *our Only God and Maſter, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* But 'tis plain that Neither of theſe Readings can be True : *Firſt*, becauſe the Word Μόνος *Only*, can by no means be aſcribed to *Chriſt*, as it frequently is (by way of *Eminence*) to *the Father* : And *Secondly*, becauſe the Word [Δεσπότης *Supreme Lord*] is Never applied to *Chriſt* in the New Teſtament, though *Grotius* (by Miſtake) affirms that it is, in his Note on thoſe Words, 2 *Pet.* 2, 1, *Denying the Lord* [Δεσπότην] *that bought them.* The Comment of the Learned Dr *Whitby* upon which place, is very remarkable : " Chriſt *(ſaith he)* be- " ing never ſtiled Δεσπότης in the New " Teſtament ; and St *Jude* (ver. 4) diſtin- " guiſhing this Δεσπότης, or *Maſter*, from " our Lord ; it ſeems moſt reaſonable to " interpret This of *God the Father* ; who " is ſaid to have *bought* the Jews, *Deut.*

" 32,

" 32, 6, *Is he not thy Father who has* " bought *thee?* And the Chriſtians, 1 *Cor.* " 6, 20, *Ye are* bought *with a Price*; " *therefore glorify God in your Body, and in* " *your Spirit, which are God's*" : To which may be added, 1 *Pet.* 1; 17, 18, 19, *If ye call on the* Father, ——*ye know that ye were not* redeemed *with corruptible things*, ——*but with the* precious Blood of Chriſt, *as of a Lamb without blemiſh.* Now as Chriſt is no where in the New Teſtament ſtiled Δεσπότης (but *God the Father* only, as *Luke* 2, 29; *Acts* 4, 24; 2 *Tim.* 2, 21; *Jude*, 4; and *Rev.* 6, 10;) ſo in other the moſt Antient Writers, and particularly in *Clemens*'s Epiſtle, the neareſt to the Apoſtolical Stile; the Word δεσπότης, and ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων, [*the Supreme Lord of all,*] is with the greateſt Care continually appropriated to *God the Father.* What *Grotius* (on 2 *Pet.* 2, 1,) alleges to the contrary, out of *Reſponſ. ad Orthodoxos*, is out of a late and ſpurious Book.

Againſt all this, your Friend has nothing to allege; and therefore he lets paſs my Tranſlation of the Word δεσπότης, (which I juſt mentioned in my *Scripture-doctrine*, and have here more largely explained,) without making any Remark upon it at all. The only thing he has here to obſerve, is; that whereas I cited a Paſſage out of Biſhop *Pearſon*,

Pearſon, wherein That learned Writer ſays, (ſpeaking of *God the Father*,) that *He is the Only Potentate, becauſe He alone has all Power of Himſelf, and whoſoever elſe has Any, hath it from Him, either by Donation or Permiſſion*; " we muſt not ", ſays your Friend, " underſtand this Citation out of " *Pearſon*, as if That learned Author meant " that *the Son*—received his Power from the " Father either by Donation or Permiſſion ". And *Why* muſt we not underſtand That learned Author to *mean*, what he ſo expreſsly *affirms?* Why, " Becauſe he ſays " in another place, that God was *always* " *Father*, as *always God:* Which SEEMS " to import, that the Character of *Father* " depends——not upon the Will:—— " that the Son is as Neceſſarily *Son*, as the " Father is *Father*; and that therefore his " Power is no more by bare *Donation* from " the Father, than his very Being ". Suppoſe now the *latter* words of Biſhop *Pearſon*, had not only *SEEMED* to import, but had *really* imported what your Friend thinks they import. Would it from thence have followed, that his *former* words did not *mean* what they plainly *expreſs?* No: it would only have followed, that in the *latter* words he had affirmed ſomething, which, by a conſequence, whereof perhaps he might not be aware, deſtroyed his *former* words. For if the *Will* of the Father was not concerned

cerned in the Generation of the Son, it will follow unavoidably that the Son was not *generated at all from the Father*, but was as much *Self-existent* as the Father himself. For whatever is caused by an *Intelligent Being*, is caused by the *Will* of That Being. Otherwise it is not (in Truth and Reality) caused by *That Being* at all, but by some Superiour Cause, (be it *Necessity*, or *Fate*, or *Whatever* it be;) under which, the *Intelligent Being* is in such Case as much an *Instrument only*, as if it was wholly *Unintelligent*. For which Reason, All the Learnedest of the Orthodox Fathers, who understood how to argue closely and strongly; *Justin Martyr*, *Origen*, *Novatian*, *Eusebius*, the Council of *Sirmium*, *Marius Victorinus*, *Basil*, *Gregory Nyssen*, and indeed almost all Antient Writers excepting only *Athanasius*; professedly argue (as I have shown at large in my *Scripture-doctrine*, *Part II*, §. 17,) that the *Son* was generated of the Father, not by *absolute Necessity of Nature*, but by an Act of his eternal *Power and Will*. Which is the only intelligible Foundation of that *Authority* the Scripture every where ascribes to *the Father* in the *Mission* of *the Son*. And though the Scripture has no where indeed *in express Terms*, *declared* the Generation of the Son to be by the *Will* of the Father; yet it does so by *plain Consequence*, when

our Lord says concerning himself, *Joh.* 5, 26, *As the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he GIVEN to the Son to have Life in Himself.*

N° 16.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 444. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 36.

MATT. VI, 9. *Our Father, which art in Heaven.*

Upon this Text, your Learned Friend was obliged by his Hypothesis to say so absurd a thing, that a Man of his Sincerity and Goodness could not speak it in his *own* Words; and therefore he only repeats the words of *Tertullian*, who says, that *The Son also is invoked in the Father*; and (speaking of *Christ*'s delivering this Prayer,) that *God only could teach how he would have HIMSELF be prayed to.*

Now if This were true, it would follow, that when *Christ* prayed to his *Father*, he prayed to *Himself*; and when any Man prays to *the Son* to *intercede* for him, he prays to *the Father* to *intercede* for him; and when *St John* says that *Christ* is our *Advocate with the Father*, he means that the *Son* is an Advocate to *Himself*. With many other such Absurdities, as not only *Tertullian*'s Authority, but even that of an

Angel

Angel from Heaven, would be very insufficient to establish in the Opinion of any reasonable Man, who had ever read the New Testament. Your Friend (I presume) *sees* not these Consequences, because he writes every where like a very sincere and good Man: But yet, for all that, they *are* Consequences, and as *evident* ones too, as any in *Euclid*.

N° 17.

1 Tim. II, 5. *For there is One God; and One Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.* In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 501 & 244. In the *Answer*, p. 37.

That the words, *One God*, are here meant of the *Father only*, is evident from hence, that they are used as a Description of the *Relative Person*, to whom the *One Mediatour* makes Intercession. For, *to whom* is the *Mediation* made? Is it not *to the Father?* 1 *Joh.* 2, 1, *We have an Advocate with the* FATHER, *Jesus Christ the Righteous.* Not *an Advocate with the Father and the Son*; For then *Christ*, who mediates as *God-man*, would mediate to *Himself*: Which is absurd.

What does your learned Friend answer to This? Why, the *One God* (he says) is

ſpoken in *oppoſition to Falſe Gods*. Not ſo in this place: For there is no mention of *Falſe Gods* in the Context: But *One God* is put directly as the *Perſon mediated to*, (which all Men allow to be the *Father* only,) in contradiſtinction to the *Perſon mediating to him*, which is the *Whole Perſon of the Son incarnate*. Wherefore though *the mentioning the Son here* (as your Friend goes on) *After the One God*, had not *in it ſelf* been *a ſufficient Argument that he is excluded out of the One God*; yet the mentioning him with the Character of *Mediatour*, in contradiſtinction to the *One God* mentioned under the Character of the *Perſon mediated to*, evidently ſhows him to be not included here by the Apoſtle in Him whom He thus ſtiles by way of Eminence *the One God*.

All the Paſſages that follow, cited out of the Antients, to prove that they ſtiled Chriſt, *God*; (together with your Friends very *obſcure* Comments upon ſome of them;) are entirely beſides the Purpoſe. For I have already often ſhown, in what Senſe they taught (without the *Confuſion* your Friend introduces,) that Chriſt, both God and Man, became our Mediatour and Interceſſour, in order to bring Men back to His and Their God and Father Supreme abſolutely over All. [Ut perducat ad Patrem, *That he might bring them to his Father*; ſays *Cyprian*,

prian, in one of the passages your Friend cites. Προσαγαγεῖν ὁ θεὸς λόγος τῷ ὅλῃ πάσῃ θεῷ, *God the Word brings back the Soul of Man to the Supreme God over all*; says *Origen*, contr. Celf. lib. 6. Τὸν κόσμον προσαγαγὴ τῷ Πατρὶ, *That he might reconcile the World unto his Father*, says *Athanasius*, Epist. ad Philadelph.]

N° 18.

Rev. XXII, 9. *Worship God.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 532. In the *Answer*, pag. 42.

Cyprian, (says your Friend,) reads or explains it thus: *Worship the Lord Jesus.*

The whole Passage of *Cyprian*, is as follows: "*God the* "*Father* (saith he) *Commanded* "*that his Son should be* "*worshipped: And the Apostle* "*Paul, mindful of the Divine* "*Command, says accordingly*; "God hath exalted him, and "hath given him a Name "which is above every Name; "that at the Name of Jesus "every knee should bow, of "things in Heaven, and things "in Earth, and things under the Earth:

Pater Deus præcepit filium suum adorari; & Apostolus Paulus, divini præcepti memor, ponit & dicit; *Deus exaltavit illum, & donavit illi nomen, quod est super omne nomen, ut in nomine Jesu omne genu flectatur, cælestium, terrestrium, & infernorum:* Et in Apocalypsi Angelus Joanni volenti adorare se, resistit & dicit; *Vide ne feceris, quia conservus tuus sum, & fratrum tuorum: Jesum Dominum adora.* De bono Patientiæ.

" *And in the Revelation, when John would* " *have worſhipped the Angel, he forbad him,* " *ſaying* ; See thou do it not, for I am thy " Fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren ; " Worſhip the Lord Jeſus ". *Thus Cyprian.*

Now from this whole paſſage, what any Man can infer contrary to any thing I have any where affirmed, I cannot imagine. Only inſtead of the words which *We* now read, *Worſhip God*, (that is, according to the general Uſe of the word *God* in the New Teſtament, *worſhip the Father* ;) *Cyprian* either read in his Copies, or perhaps cited by his Memory, the following words, *Worſhip the Lord Jeſus.* Which, though not the True Reading of the *Text*, yet contains nothing in it inconſiſtent with what I ſaid in my *Scripture-doctrine* concerning *abſolutely Supreme Worſhip* being *peculiar* to the *Perſon of the Father.* For ſo we find in Scripture a *Worſhip* given to *Chriſt*, which *cannot* be given to *God the Father :* Rev. 1, 5, *Unto Him that loved us, and waſhed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God and his Father,* [τῷ Θεῷ & πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, unto His God and Father ;] *to Him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever, Amen.*

No

N° 19.

LUKE 1; 16, 17. *Many shall He* [John the Baptist] *turn to the Lord their God; and he shall go before* Him, *&c.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 534. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 43.

The Title, *Lord God*, in the common and natural Apprehension of all Mankind, and in the constant Usage of Scripture, is a *PERSONAL Character*; expressing, not *speculative and metaphysical Qualities*, but *Personal and Relative Perfections*, namely *Dominion and Government* over the World. As appears plainly from the *Relative* Terms so frequently joined with it, *OUR God*, *OUR Lord God*, the *God OF HEAVEN*, and the like: None of which Terms can be joined with *metaphysical* Appellations, which are *Absolute* and *not Relative*; such as are, The *Infinite Being*, The *Eternal Being*, and the like.

By this Term therefore, *Lord God*, in the present Text, must of necessity be meant either *God the Father*, considered as *Supreme and absolute Lord of all*; or else *the Son*, who, by communication of the Father's Power and Dominion, is also, in Subordination to Him, truly *Lord of all.*

In which soever of these Senses it be understood, nothing can from this Text be

inferred contrary to any thing I have affirmed. For if the Title, *Lord God*, be here applied to *the Son*; it is ſtill applied to him in the Senſe now explained: And if it be meant of *the Father*, (as I think is more probable;) then the latter part of the Text is, by an eaſy Figure, a Tranſition from the Perſon of Him who is *the Inviſible God*, to the Perſon of Him who is *the Image of the Inviſible God*, and who always acts and ſpeaks in *His* Name and Authority. A Figure not unuſual, either in Scripture or other Authors. *See my Scripture-doctrine*, *No* 538, 597, 616 *&* 1056: Alſo 1 *Joh.* 3, 1, compared with *ver.* 5.

Your Friend contends that the Title, *Lord God*, is here given to *the Son*. And if it was ſo, in the Senſe wherein *his own Quotations out of the Fathers* (as I ſhall ſhow preſently) give that Title to *Chriſt*; it would not prove any thing at all againſt *Me*. For Moſt of thoſe Fathers, in *thoſe very Paſſages* he cites, explain themſelves (as will appear immediately) in the very ſame manner as I have done. But your Friend, not content to underſtand theſe words in the Text, in the ſame Senſe as *the like words* are found in his Quotations; labours to ſuggeſt another Senſe, which yet he cares not to expreſs diſtinctly, but leaves it darkly to his Reader to infer as well as he can. If his words infer any thing; it

muſt

must be, that the *Son* is so stiled *Lord God*, as not to be distinguished from *the Father*: Which, when expressed intelligibly, can end in nothing else, (though your Friend seems not to intend it,) but in denying *the Son* to have Any Being at all: Which is the *Socinian* Notion. And *What Need* is there of interpreting Scripture after so unintelligible a manner, when *All the Texts* in their obvious and natural Sense carry with them another Signification? That which seems to have led your Friend into This, is a Notion he has entertained of certain *Scripture-Interpretations justly Conceived to be founded upon* TRADITION, and of certain *Doctrines and Expositions of the Sacred Writings, handed down to* the Fathers *by* TRADITION *from Their Fathers*. What and where this *Tradition* is, it does not appear: For the Greater Part of the Fathers *plainly enough* express the very Notion I am pleading for; (as the Reader will see presently in those very Passages, which your Friend has cited to prove the contrary:) But What that Doctrine is, which your Friend alludes to as *Traditionary*, remains very *obscure*; and he himself leaves it to his Reader to guess at, rather than any where explicitly expresses it. What he drops in different places, amounts (if any thing) to a *Total Confusion of Persons*: Which Persons he sometimes speaks of, pag. 51, & 49.

pag. 58, & 28. of, as being One *subordinate* to Another; and at other times, as if he thought them All but *One Person*. Your Friend being a sincere and sober-minded Man, has entred only a little way into these Traditionary Explications of Scripture: But those who have gone far into them, (as some late Writers have done,) have given such *Visionary and Cabbalistical* Interpretations, especially of the Old Testament; as give too sad an Occasion for Infidels to look upon all Religion as Enthusiasm; and particularly have caused the Study of the *Hebrew* Language, (which in itself is a plain, easy, inartificial Language,) to be brought (by Men of weak Judgments abusing it) into the utmost Contempt.

But to proceed to *particulars*.

It seems to Me that the Term, *Lord God*, in the Text before us, signifies *the Father*. My Reason is, because this Title, *the Lord God*, when used absolutely, and without any antecedent Mention of the Person it refers to, does in Scripture-Language, by way of Eminence, Always signify the Father. Thus in this very Chapter, *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel*, (says *Zacharias*, ver. 68,) for *that he hath raised up an horn of Salvation for us in the House of his Servant David*; viz. for that he hath raised up unto us *That Lord, before whom* John the Baptist was to *go*, *ver. 76*. To

This,

This, your Friend replies, that elsewhere *St Thomas* calls Christ, *My Lord and my God.* But I answer, This is plainly meant in That Sense, in which *St Paul* applies to him the Title *God* in that Citation out of the Psalmist; *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever;——thou hast loved Righteousness;—— therefore GOD, even THY GOD,* [or, *therefore, O God, THY GOD*] *hath anointed thee, &c.* Your Friend alleges but one Text more, *Rev.* 22, 6, *The Lord God of the Holy Prophets sent his Angel:* And This he thinks is meant of *the Son*, because it is said, *Rev.* 1, 1, that *Jesus sent his Angel.* As if it might not very properly be said, that *God the Father* sent That Angel, whom *Christ* sent forth with that Revelation which *God the Father* gave him to send by the Angel. There are in Scripture innumerable Instances of the like manner of speaking. And that *the Lord God of the Holy Prophets* does indeed here signify *the Father*, is evident from hence, that, in the five fore-going Verses of the same Chapter, the word, *God*, and *Lord God*, are used two or three times in express contradistinction to *the Lamb.* pag. 44.

As to the Passages your Friend cites out of the *Old* Testament; if they be understood literally, (in the manner he cites and applies them,) they prove too much for him, *viz.* that *Christ* is *God the Father himself*; pag. 45.

himself; that is to say, in other words, that *Christ* is a *mere Man only*, in whom *God the Father* dwelt. But if they must not be thus understood, (as he will grant they must not, though he takes no Care to avoid it;) then they can no otherwise be understood, than according to *St. Stephen*'s Explication, *Acts* 7, 30, where he says, *The Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a Flame of Fire in the Bush,——Saying, I am the God of thy Fathers*; Which is plainly the *Angel of Gods presence* speaking in the Name and Person and Authority of the Father.

And in *This* Sense, if the Title, *Lord God*, in the Text before us, be understood of *the Son*, it will not prove any thing against Me. Any more than your Friend's Citations out of the Fathers do: Which when the Reader compares, he will be surprized to find almost all of them most *fully and plainly* expressing that Sense I am now speaking of, and not at all That which your Friend cites them for.

The place he cites out of *Justin*, is: that *Christ is Lord and God*; yet so, as that *the Father is the Cause* [ἀλλός τι αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι καὶ κύριον καὶ θεὸν] *of his being both Lord and God.* Directly contrary to what he cited it for. pag. 47.

The Places he cites out of *Irenæus*, are: That *no other is named God or Lord, but* pag. 47 & 50, & 51.

He

He who is the GOD AND LORD OF ALL, and His Son Jesus Christ Our Lord;— He who RULES OVER ALL, namely, God the Father; and his Son who has RECEIVED from Him Dominion over all Creatures; so as to be *Truly God and Lord*, [as a *Son* in his own House, *Heb.* 3, 6;] and not as *Moses* was stiled *a God to Pharaoh*, being indeed only *a Servant*, Heb. 3, 5. All This again, directly contrary to what it was cited for.

The place he cites from the *Synod of Antioch*, is: *The Messenger* [Ἄγγελος, *The Angel*] *of the Father, is the Son; who himself is Lord and God.* This also, directly contrary to what he cited it for.

Lastly, when he alleges *Novatian* thus speaking; *From what has been already said to prove the Divinity of Christ, it is demonstrated that Jesus Christ is Lord and God, which the HERETICKS deny:* That the Reader may know who they are, that *Novatian* esteemed *Hereticks*; I desire him to observe the following words of the same Author in the very next Chapter: *It is so manifestly* (saith he) *declared in Scripture, that Christ is God; that most of the HERETICKS, struck with the Greatness and Truth of his Divinity, and extending his Honour*

Usque adeò Hunc manifestum est in Scripturis esse Deum tradi, ut plerique, *Hæreticorum*, divinitatis ipsius magnitudine & veritate commoti, ultra modum extendentes honores ejus, ausisient non Filium, sed ipsum Deum Patrem promere & putare. *De Trin. cap.* 18.

Honour even too far, have dared to ſpeak of him not as of the Son, but as of God the Father himſelf.

N° 20.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 535. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 52.

JOHN I, 1. *And the Word was God.*

Of theſe words, I ſaid, there are only *Three* Poſſible Interpretations. The *firſt* is, that the word was *That ſame Perſon*, whom he was *with*: And This is both a *Contradiction* in Terms, and alſo the antient Hereſy of *Sabellius*. The *ſecond* is; that the Word was *Another Self-exiſtent, Underived, Independent Perſon, co-ordinate to Him with whom he was*: And This is the Impiety of *Polytheiſm*; ſubverting that Firſt and Great Foundation of All Religion both Natural and Revealed, the *Unity* of GOD. The *third* is; that the Word is a Perſon, (not λόγῳ ἐνδιαθέτῳ, the *internal Reaſon* or *Wiſdom* of God, which is merely an *Attribute* of the Father; but a *Perſon*, whoſe *Name is called The Word of God*, Rev. 19, 13: The *Interpreter and Meſſenger of his Father*, Λογῳ—τῷ ἑωυτοῦ παλαιὸς Ἑρμηνεὺς καὶ Ἄγγελῳ, *Athanaſ. contra Gentes*: God *by communication of Divinity from Him who is of Himſelf God*, μετοχῇ τοῦ Ἀυτοθέου θεοποιέμενῳ,

μερος, *Origen. in Joh. pag.* 46 :) a Person, *deriving* from the Father (with whom he existed before the World was,) both his Being itself, and incomprehensible Power and Knowledge, and other *divine* Attributes and Authority, in a Manner not revealed, and which Humane Wisdom ought not to presume to be able more particularly to explain.

Against this Exposition of mine, your Friend alleges nothing but a *metaphysical* Inquiry, concerning *Substances* and *Essences*; which the Scripture never at all meddles with, either one way or other: And a figurative Passage out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and another of *Irenæus*; which Passages the Reader may understand, by *comparing* them with other Passages cited above out of the same Writers.

N° 21.

Acts XX, 28. *To feed the Church of God; which He hath purchased with his own Blood.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 538. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 54.

Upon this Text I observed, *First*; that the Best and most Antient Copies read it, and the most Antient Fathers cite it, *The Church of the LORD.* This, your Learned Friend conceals entirely from his Reader.

er. Which he ſhould by no means have done; becauſe it removes at once all the difficulty that appears in the conſtruction of the Words.

Secondly, I obſerved that the Word, *God*, (if that Reading be True,) may poſſibly be underſtood of *Chriſt*, in like manner as in *John*, I, 1. But if, (which is much more natural, ſuppoſing That Reading to be genuine,) it be underſtood to mean *the Father*; then either, *his own Blood*, muſt ſignify, *the Blood of his own Son*; or elſe the Words, *He hath purchaſed with his own Blood*, may ſtill be underſtood of *Chriſt*, in the ſame manner of ſpeaking that we find uſed by *St Luke*, *ch.* I; 16, 17: Not much unlike to which, is that Tranſition from one Perſon to another, which St *John* uſes in his firſt Epiſtle, *ch.* 3, *ver.* 1, compared with *ver.* 5.

But your Friend contends for another Interpretation, *viz.* that the Word, *God*, ſignifies in this place *Both Father and Son*. Of which Confuſion, I am very ſure there is no Inſtance in the whole Bible; that one and the ſame *perſonal* and *relative* Title, ſuch as *God* or *Lord* or *King* or *Father* or *Son* or the like, ſhould at one and the ſame time ſignify
Pag 55. Two Perſons. Yes, *he ſays*, St *John* comprehends the *Father and Son* under the Name *God*, in the *firſt verſe of his Goſpel*; and therefore may be ſuppoſed to uſe the ſame

ſame Name ſometimes for *the Father*, and ſometimes for *the Son*, or for *Both Together*. But does St *John* indeed uſe the Word, *God*, (not only ſometimes for *the Father*, and ſometimes for *the Son*, but alſo) for *Both Together?* Verily, had your Friend conſidered here what he ſaid, I am perſwaded he would not have ſtood to it. For obſerve what a Paraphraſe his Criticiſm makes, when applied to the Text he directs us to apply it to. *John*, I, 1. *The Word was with God, and the Word was God*; that is, *The Word was with the Father and the Son, and the Word was the Father and the Son.* This is no miſrepreſentation of his Senſe; but is his True, real, and profeſſed Meaning. For his *Deſign* is to ſhow, not that the Word, *God*, means in one part of the Sentence *the Son*, and in the other *the Father*; but that the ſame individual Word ſingly in one part of the Sentence alone, ſignifies *Both Father and Son.* I wonder much, he ſhould not ſee the Abſurdity of it. Well: But in that Paſſage I referred to, 1 *John*, 3, 1, he thinks the Caſe is plain: *Behold what manner of Love the Father hath beſtowed upon us, that we ſhould be called the Sons of God:* In this place, he ſays, the Term *God* may very well be judged to ſtand for the *Father and the Son.* Let us ſee how that can be. Why, the Waſhing of Regeneration, *ſays he*, through the Vir-

tue of their Names invoked in Baptiſm, begets us into Children, ſo that we are the *Sons* of *Both Perſons*. By *This* Argument he *ſhould* have ſaid, we are the *Sons* of the *Three Perſons*. But the Scripture gives quite a different Account of this Matter. We are There called *The Sons of God*, becauſe *we* are made, in our meaſure and degree, by *Adoption and Grace*, what *Chriſt* was, in a complete and perfect manner, by *Nature*: We are repreſented as *Heirs of God*, and *Joint-Heirs with Chriſt*, that is, *Brethren of Chriſt* and *Sons of God*. If then *our* being *Sons of God*, means that we are *Sons of the Father and the Son*; then alſo *Chriſt's* being the *Son of God*, means that he is *the Son of the Father and the Son*. When once Confuſion is introduced, there is no End of Abſurdities. But your Friend draws one Argument more, from the Word [φανερωθῇ, *he ſhall appear*,] uſed in the next verſe, 1 *John*, 3, 2. *Now are we the Sons of God*, (that is, *ſaith he*, of the One God, Father
[a] 56. and Son:) *But when He ſhall appear*, (that is, *ſaith he*, when the One God ſhall appear in the Perſon of the Son.) Put now theſe two Explications together, and then the whole verſe ſtands thus: *Now are we the Sons of* the Father and the Son; *But when* the Father and the Son *ſhall appear in the Perſon of the Son, we ſhall be like HIM* &c.

&c. I trust your Friend will be ashamed of This, when he considers it again.

N° 22.

JOH. I, 3. *All things were made by Him,* [Gr. δι' αὐτοῦ, *Through him.*] In the *Scripture-doctrine,* N° 246.

These Words, I said, were fully and clearly explained by the parallel Texts, *Eph.* 3, 9, *God created all things By Jesus Christ*; and *Heb.* 1, 2, *By whom also He made the Worlds.* And in This Explication, all the Antient Fathers, how much soever they differ from each other in Other things, unanimously agree. Even *Tertullian*, in his Book against *Praxeas*: [Alium, *per quem* omnia; alium, *a quo* omnia:] *One*, saith he, *Of whom are all things*; *Another*, *By* (or *Through*) *whom are all things*: Commenting this very Text of St *John*. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 57.

Here therefore your Learned Friend *attempts not* to allege against Me, either Scripture or Antiquity. Only, after having expressly granted *All* that I contend for, *viz.* that the Son *works every thing in Obedience to his Father*; the *Father* working *primarily*, the *Son subordinately*: he adds, *Yet* the Son *works Freely*. Which I very readi- *pag.* 57 & 58.

ly grant him, in return for what he has granted to *Me*. For I never thought, (and I believe no body elſe ever did,) that the *Father* uſes the Son as an *Unintelligent*, but as an *Intelligent Inſtrument*. Whatever *the Father* does *by the Son*, he does by the *Free Will* of the Son, concurring with and accompliſhing the good pleaſure of his Father. *The Son quickneth whom he will*, Joh. 5, 21; *Freely*, and by his own Will: Becauſe, *(ver. 22,) the Father hath committed All judgment unto the Son.* So again, *Joh.* 10, 18, *No Man taketh my Life from me, but I lay it down of myſelf*, [Freely and Willingly:] *I have Power to lay it down, and I have Power to take it again*; [Becauſe] *This Commandment have I received of my Father.*

N° 23.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 580. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 58.

JOHN V, 18. *But ſaid alſo that God was his Father* [πατέρα ἴδιον, his own Father,] *making himſelf equal with God.*

Your learned Friend, in his Explication of this Text, begins to indulge his *Imagination*, more than is uſual for ſo calm and reaſonable a Writer. *The Jews*, he ſays, *pag.* 59. *who drew the Inference, MUST have had ſome*

ſome reaſon for underſtanding the Premiſe in ſo exalted a Senſe, as would infer their Concluſion: that is, they MUST *have had a Notion that there was a certain Perſon ſo cloſely united to the Great God,——that the Great God was his Proper Father, and that on This account he was Equal with the Father:——For except all this be ſuppoſed, it is difficult to account how ſo extraordinary a Concluſion* COULD *be drawn from a Premiſe, that was otherwiſe capable of a lower Interpretation. Now it is* CERTAIN *that the Jews, if they underſtood the Meaning of their own Scriptures,* MUST *have known, that there was a Divine Perſon ſubſiſting with the Father——from the Beginning of the World, which is called Wiſdom; as is* EVIDENT *from* Prov. 9, 22, The Lord poſſeſſed me in the Beginning,——*and that this Divine Perſon was* brought forth, *or begotten,* when there were no Depths, *Prov.* 8, 24; *And* BY CONSEQUENCE *that this Divine Perſon* MUST *be the Only begotten.——They* MUST *have alſo known that God had a Son,* Prov. 30, 4; *and that This Son is the ſame with Wiſdom or the Only-begotten; otherwiſe Wiſdom could not be the Only-begotten, if there be a Son begotten different from Wiſdom.——The Jews, I ſay, could not have been ignorant of theſe great Truths, upon the* SUPPOSITION *of*

their Knowledge of the Scriptures; and this Knowledge OUGHT to be SUPPOSED, 'till the Contrary be made to APPEAR.

Is not This now a wonderful Flight of Imagination; to conceive that the *Affirmative* ought always to be *Suppoſed*, 'till the *Negative appears?* that *every Man* ought to be *ſuppoſed* to know *every thing*, 'till the contrary appears? and that *every Accuſation* brought againſt our Saviour by his *malitious Enemies*, muſt needs be in *Them* a *True Deduction from True Principles Truly underſtood?* That the Jews, not only underſtood our Saviours calling *God* his *Father*, to be a claiming to himſelf *more than any other Man or Prophet could claim*; but that they underſtood alſo clearly every thing that was hinted in the Old Teſtament, even in the obſcureſt Prophecies, concerning the Greatneſs and Dignity of his Perſon? The *Apoſtles*, after they had converſed with him for ſeveral Years, and, beſides their *own* Knowledge of the Old Teſtament, had heard *Him* alſo frequently explain it to them; and had heard him moreover expreſsly declare that *his Kingdom was not of this World*, but that at the End *He ſhould come in the Glory of his Father with his Angels* to judge the whole World; were yet ſo ignorant, even after his Reſurrection, as to ask him, *Lord, wilt thou*

pag. 59.

thou at This time restore again the [temporal] *Kingdom to Israel:* And had the *Jews*, his Accusers, so perfect a Knowledge of his *spiritual Kingdom*, as to understand all the *literal*, and all the *mystical* Prophecies concerning him, as perfectly as any Christian has ever done to This day? Surely, there never was a more extraordinary Imagination.

The True State of the whole Matter, is plainly no more than This. Our Saviour having healed a Lame Man upon the *Sabbath-day*, was accused and persecuted by the Jews as a *Sabbath-breaker*. To This, our Saviour replies, *ver.* 17, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work:* That is to say; Though the works of God are finished from the Foundation of the World, and *my Father* ceased indeed on the *Seventh day* from his works of *Creation*; yet his works of *Providence and Goodness* go on *every day* for ever without Intermission; and *I* likewise do works of Goodness and Charity, even on the Sabbath-day. The Jews, willing to take any handle (though never so unreasonable) of Accusing him, infer, *ver.* 18, (by way of *Calumny*, not by way of *strict Reasoning*,) that his calling God his *Father* [ὁ πατὴρ μου,] was as much as assuming to Himself, that God who was the *common Father of them All*, was in a higher and more peculiar manner [πατέρα ἴδιον] *His*

Heb. 4, 3.

His own *proper Father :* And from This, and from his joyning and comparing his own Works with his Fathers Works in one and the ſame Sentence, they infer further, in the *next* ſtep of *Calumny*, that he *made himſelf equal with God :* Meaning thereby, not that he claimed to Himſelf to be *God indeed* in *Any* Senſe ; (for neither They nor his own Diſciples had as yet any the leaſt Thought of That ;) but that by *Conſequence*, (which angry Accuſers draw very haſtily,) he aſſum d to himſelf *a Power and Authority like That of God.* The Expreſſion is the ſame, and meant in the ſame Senſe, as That other Accuſation, *Joh.* 10, 33, *Thou, being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf God :* Which was ſpoken after the ſame manner, as Men ſay to an aſſuming Perſon, *You make your ſelf King* ; when they intend to charge him with taking upon himſelf, not the *Perſon*, but the *State* of a *Prince.* Accordingly, to this Accuſation of *making himſelf equal with God*, our Saviour replies, *ver.* 19, not by *confounding himſelf with the Father*, (as was to have been expected in your Friend's Scheme,) but by *referring all his works To the Father*, and ſhowing that he really was (what he pretended to be,) the promiſed *Meſſiah*, the Son of God, ſent forth from God, inveſted with the Power and Authority of the Father : That *the Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he*

he ſeeth the Father do, ver. 19: That *the Father loveth the Son, and ſhoweth him all things that himſelf doeth*, ver. 20: That *the Father hath committed all judgment to the Son*, ver. 22: That therefore, as *all Men honour the Father*, ſo they ought alſo to *honour the Son*, to the Honour of *the Father which ſent him*, ver. 23: That, *as the Father hath Life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son to have Life in himſelf*, ver. 26: That *he can of Himſelf do nothing*, and that he *ſeeketh not his own Will, but the Will of the Father which ſent him*, ver. 30: That *the works which he doth, bear witneſs of him, that the Father hath ſent him*, ver. 36. This is the Anſwer he gives to the Jews Accuſation; And it ſhows very plainly what he meant by calling *God* his *Father*, (which was the *Ground* of their Accuſation,) and by joining himſelf with the Father in thoſe words, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.*

See this whole matter further explained beneath, *No* 25 & 26.

The Paſſage your Friend cites out of *Novatian* under this Head, is very extraordinary. *Novatian* ſays, [*cap.* 31,] *The Son's Godhead is taught us in ſuch a manner, as that None may think that Two Gods are introduced* [aut diſſonantiâ aut *Inæqualitate* Divinitatis,] *either by a Difference or* Inequality

quality *of Divinity.* " That is ", *says your Friend*, " The Divinity of the Son was " taught to be like to, and *Equal* to that " of the Father ; becauſe otherwiſe, if " they were unlike and *unequal*, their Na- " tures muſt be different, and Father and " Son be diſtinct Gods ".

But now it is impoſſible for any Man who reads this very Chapter of *Novatian*, [*cap.* 31,] not to ſee that the words, which your Friend cites, are *Corrupt :* The expreſs deſign of the Author in every word of that Chapter, being to ſhow *directly on the contrary*, that, if they were abſolutely *Equal*, *then* and *for that very reaſon* they would of neceſſity be *Two Gods. If* (ſaith he) *they were Both* Equal, *they would Both be Unoriginate, and conſequently* Two Gods.——*Being found* Equal, *they would be* Two Gods.——*Being* Equal, *they would be Two Inviſibles, and conſequently* Two Gods. *But Now, whilſt the Son obeys his Father in all things ; though He himſelf alſo be* God, *yet by his Obedience he declares his Father to be* The One God, *from whom alſo he derives his Original : And therefore he could not make*

Æquatione in utroq; oſtenſâ, duos faceret innatos ; & ideò *duos* faceret *Deos.* —— *Æquales* inventi *duos Deos* reddidiſſent. —— *Par* expreſſus, duos inviſibiles oſtendiſſet, & ideò *duos* comprobâſſet & *Deos.* — Nunc autem, — dum ſe Patri in omnibus obtemperantem reddit, quamvis ſit & Deus, *Unum* tamen *Deum Patrem* de obedientiâ ſuâ oſtendit, ex quo & originem traxit : Et ideò *duos* facere non potuit, quia nec duos Origines fecit. —— Subjectis enim ei quaſi filio omnibus rebus a Patre ; dum ipſe, cum his quæ illi ſubjecta ſunt, Patri ſuo ſubjicitur ; patris quidem ſui Filius probatur, *cæterorum* autem & *Dominus & Deus.* ——

make Two Gods, *because he did not make Two original Principles.*——[Here come in the *corrupt* Words cited by your Friend.] *For all things being made subject to him as Son, by his Father; he himself, together with all things under him, being subject to his Father, is proved to be the Son indeed of the Father, but of all other things the Lord and God.— The Son indeed is shown to be* God, *because Divinity is communicated and derived to him; and yet the Father is nevertheless proved to be* The One God, *whilst That Majesty and Divinity, which the Father communicates to the Son, is by the Son in acknowledgment continually returned back to the Father who gave it. So that God the Father, is justly stiled* The God over All; *and the Original even of the Son himself, whom he begat Lord of All: And at the same time the Son is the God of all Other things, because God the Father made all things subject to Him whom he begat. Thus Jesus Christ the Mediatour between God and Men, having from his Father All Creatures subjected to him as their* God; *himself with the*

Deus quidem ostenditur Filius, cui divinitas tradita & porrecta conspicitur; & tamen nihilo minus *Unus Deus Pater* probatur, dum gradatim reciproco meatu illa majestas atq; divinitas ad Patrem, qui dederat eam, rursùm ab illo ipso Filio missa revertitur & retorquetur. Ut meritò Deus Pater, *Omnium Deus* sit, & Principium ipsius quoq; Filii sui cuem Dominum genuit; Filius autem, *cæterorum omnium Deus* sit, quoniam omnibus illum Deus Pater præposuit quem genuit. Irà Mediator Dei & hominum Christus Jesus, omnis creaturæ subjectam sibi habens a Patre proprio potestatem, quâ Deus est; cum totâ creaturâ subditâ sibi, concors Patri suo Deo inventus, *Unum & Solum & Verum DEUM* Patrem suum —— breviter approbavit. *cap.* 31.

the whole Creation under his Dominion, being in perfect Agreement with God his Father, has briefly ſhown his Father to be The One and Only and True GOD.

And again, paraphraſing That Text, *Phil.* 2, 6; *Chriſt* (ſaith he,) *THOUGH he was in the Form of God, yet did not catch at being* Equal *with God. For though he knew that he was God, as having God for his Father; yet he* never compared *himſelf with God his Father; remembring that he was* from *his Father, and that he received from his Father That very Thing,* (viz. *his being God.*) *Wherefore both before and after his taking upon him human Fleſh, and alſo after his Reſurrection, he always did and does pay all Obedience to his Father. From whence it appears, that he never thought fit ſo to claim to himſelf Divinity, as to* Equal *himſelf with God the Father: Nay on the contrary, he was always obedient to His whole Will and Pleaſure, even ſo as to be content to take upon him the Form of a Servant, that is, to become a Man.*

Hic ergo, QUAMVIS eſſet in forma Dei, non eſt rapinam arbitratus *Æqua'em* ſe Deo eſſe. Quamvis enim ſe ex Deo Patre Deum eſſe meminiſſet, *nunquam* ſe Deo Patri aut *comparavit* aut *contulit*; memor ſe eſſe ex ſuo Patre, & hoc ipſum quod eſt, habere ſe quia Pater Dediſſet. Inde deniq; & ante carnis aſſumptionem, ſed & poſt aſſumptionem corporis, poſt ipſam præterea reſurrectionem, omnem Patri in omnibus rebus obedientiam præſtitit pariter ac præſtat. Ex quo probatur, nunquam arbitratum illum eſſe rapinam quandam divinitatem, ut *æquaret* ſe Patri Deo: quinimò contrà, omni ipſius imperio & voluntati obediens atq; ſubjectus, etiam ut formam Servi ſuſciperet contentus fuit, hoc eſt, hominem illum fieri, &c. *cap.* 17.

Let

Let any ſenſible Perſon Now judge, whether the Words your Friend cited be not manifeſtly ſo corrupt, as to expreſs juſt the very contrary to what the Author in that very place intended to expreſs. How the Words ought to be read, is not eaſy to conjecture without Manuſcripts. Poſſibly inſtead of [*aut diſſonantiâ aut* Inæqualitate *Divinitatis*,] it ſhould be [*aut diſſonantiâ aut*—— (ſome Word here being dropt out) *in Æqualitate Divinitatis.*] But of this, the learned Reader muſt judge. Something to That Purpoſe, the Author *manifeſtly* meant.

N° 24.

JOH. VIII, 58, *Before Abraham was, I am.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 591. In the *Anſwer, pag.* 62.

Though the Words may poſſible be rendred, [*I Was, before Abraham was born*;] the like manner of ſpeaking being found in ſome other places of this Goſpel; as *ch.* 14, 9, τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι I M I, *Am I* (that is, *Have I been*) *ſo long time with you?* Yet I acknowledged it not to be improbable, but our Saviour might rather mean in this place (according to the unanimous Interpretation of all the Antient Fathers) to hint, that He was That Perſon in whom

whom [*Exod.* 23, 21,] *the Name of God* was; *viz.* that He was That *visible* Person, who in the Old Testament appeared, invested with the Authority and representing the Person of the *Invisible God*, and was called by His Name *Jehovah* or *I am*: According to that of S. *Stephen*, Acts 7, 30, *There appeared to Moses in the Wilderness an Angel of the Lord in a Flame of Fire in a Bush,——saying, I am the God of thy Fathers*, &c.

To this your learned Friend makes no reply in the way of Argument, but only (seeming some way or other to have misunderstood my Words,) suggests something wonderfully obscure and unintelligible; that "the *Name of God*, was a distinct "thing from the Person in whom it was;" that "consequently, not the Person of the "Son, but the *Name of God* in him, is *Je-* "*hovah* or *I am*:" that then "the Mean- "ing of the Words must have been this; "*Before Abraham was, the Name I Am ex-* "*isted*; And How could the Existence of "*the Name of God*, prove the Existence "of the *Son of God*, if the *Son* and *Name* "were Two different things?" That "it "would be strange Reasoning, for a mo- "dern Christian to prove his Existence in "the Days of Christ, from the *Name of* "*Christ* which he bears in him"; or "to "call himself *Jesus*, because he bears that "Name, or is baptized into it"; That he who

who " affirms *Self-exiſtence* to be an eſſen-
" tial part of the Idea of *Being*, is obliged
" to prove it ; ſince Others are of Opini-
" on, and with good Reaſon, that it rather
" relates to the manner of exiſting of the
" firſt Perſon in the Divine Being, than
" to the Nature or Eſſence of Being it
" ſelf" : That " if the Angel, or Chriſt,
" in reſpect of his Divine Nature, is a di-
" ſtinct Subject, or ſubſtantially different
" from *the Name of God* in him ; ſuch a
" Conſtruction of the Places compared,
" [*viz.* Exod. 23, 21, *and* Acts 7, 30,]
" cannot be approved of :——But if it be
" intended to ſhow, that the Angel or
" Chriſt is a diſtinct Subject or ſubſtantial-
" ly different from the *Name of God* in
" him, not in reſpect of his Divine Nature,
" but of a Created Nature aſſumed by the
" Word at the beginning of all things, as
" the Firſt-fruits of the Creation, and
" in reſpect of which He may be more pro-
" perly and accurately denominated an
" Angel ; it may be readily aſſented to,
" as a ſtrong Probability, not a little favour-
" ed by the Sacred Writings.

To All This, ſince I underſtand it not at all, I hope you will be ſo Good as not to expect I ſhould return any Anſwer.

No

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 594 *and* 595. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 65 *and* 69.

N° 25 & 26.

JOH. X, 30. *I and my Father are One.*

And

JOH. X, 33. *That Thou, being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf God.*

Your learned Friend underſtands theſe Texts, of an *Unity of Nature*; But what he means By *Unity of Nature*, he declares not. Moſt uſually, what he ſays about it, amounts to an *Unity of Perſon:* As when he ſays, *Jehovah our God, Jehovah is One*; Which, in the Scripture, is expreſsly ſpoken of *One Perſon*; as has been ſhown above, N° 1. So likewiſe, when he ſays, *The Father and Son IS the One True God:* and that *Of him are all things, as HE is Father*; *Through him, as HE is Son*; *and To him, as HE is the Holy Ghoſt*; This is undeniably reducing them to *One Perſon* only. Nor does he any where ſhow, what he means by That *Unity of Nature*; in which, *Two Perſons, Two Intelligent Agents*, Equally *Supreme*, ſhall not be *TWO Gods*, that is, *Two abſolutely Supreme Governours*. However, without knowing diſtinctly what he intends by *Unity of Nature*, he proceeds to *prove* that theſe Two Texts *are* meant

pag. 66

pag. 66.

pag. 28.

of

of an *Unity of Nature :* Not by considering the *Context*, and the Connexion of the words ; but by Two *foreign* Arguments. The *first*, is ; that the Name of God, [*Jehovah*,] is in several places of Scripture given to *the Son:* And in what manner This is done, I have just now explained, in the fore-going *N*o 24. The *second* Argument is, a Collection of Sentences out of the Fathers : *Some* of which, do not at all mean what your Friend thinks of ; (especially those of *Novatian* ; As the Reader will find by comparing the Passages themselves with what immediately goes before and follows after, and with the other Passages which I have above cited out of the same Author :) And *the Rest* are no Proofs at all, what is the True Meaning of the Texts now before us.

That there is a reasonable Sense, in which the Father and the Son, though One be Self-existent and the Other not, may yet truly be affirmed to be of the *same Nature*, (though the Scripture never enters into such metaphysical Speculations,) I deny not. But the Question Now is, not what may or may not Truly be affirmed *in general*, but what is the True Meaning of the *particular Texts* at present before us. And This is to be gathered, not from our own or other Mens preconceived *Hypotheses*, but from the Scope and Connexion

of our Saviours whole Diſcourſe in the Texts referred to.

Ver. 24, The Jews ask our Saviour, *How long doſt thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Chriſt, tell us plainly.* Our Saviour replies, *ver.* 25, *The works that I do in my Fathers Name, they bear witneſs of Me*; That is, The Miracles which he worked by the Power and Authority of the Father, proved him to be in reality, what he pretended to be, the *Meſſiah*, ſent forth from God.

Ver. 26, *But ye* (ſaith he) *believe not, becauſe ye are not of my Sheep*; That is, they were prejudiced, vitious, and unreclaimable Perſons.

Ver. 27 & 28, *My Sheep* [well-diſpoſed and unprejudiced Perſons] *hear my Voice and—follow me*; *And I give unto them eternal Life, and they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall any pluck them out of my hand.*

Ver. 29 & 30, For *My Father, which Gave them me, is Greater than All*; *and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hands*: and *I and my Father are One.* That is: Since None can pluck them out of *the Father*'s hands, and the Father has communicated *His Power* to *the Son*; therefore None can pluck them out of *the Son*'s hands: So that, being in *the Father*'s hands, or being in *the Son*'s hands, is *One and the*

ſame

same thing. [This is the natural Sense of the words, to which the Construction and Connexion of the whole Discourse leads us. And since the same words are used also in other places of Scripture in the very same Sense; As, *Joh.* 17, 22, *That They* (my Disciples) *may be One, even as We* (I and the Father) *are One*; *I in Them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in One*; And 1 *Cor.* 3, 8, *He that planteth, and he that watereth*, (Paul and Apollos,) *are One*; 'Tis evident that the Sense, in which your Friend desires to take This Text, cannot be gathered from the Words themselves, nor from the Connexion of our Lord's Discourse, but must be proved (if it be proved at all,) by some other ways.]

Ver. 31 & 33, Upon this, *the Jews took up Stones to stone him,——saying;——we stone thee——for Blasphemy, and because that Thou, being a Man, makest thy self God.* Meaning to accuse him, (as I have shown above, *N°* 23,) not of affirming himself to be *the Supreme, Self-existent Deity*; nay, nor so much as of taking upon himself to be a *Divine Person* at all; but only of assuming to himself the *Power* and *Authority of God.* For, their Accusation, *thou makest thy self God*, was not founded (as your Friend imagines, *pag.* 70,) upon his affirming himself to be *One* with the Fa-

ther, (which Phraſe it does not appear they thought at all difficult to be underſtood;) but the Accuſation was founded upon his ſtiling *God* his *Father*, [ver. 25, 29 & 30,] and conſequently making himſelf the *Son of God*. This appears plainly, from the Anſwer our Lord gave them in the words immediately following, *ver.* 34, 35, 36, *Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid, ye* [Rulers and Magiſtrates] *are Gods,* [and Children of the moſt High ?] *If he called Them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of Him whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I AM THE SON OF GOD?* From theſe words 'tis evident, that their Charge againſt him of *Blaſphemy*, for which they went about to Stone him, was founded upon his calling *God* his *Father*, (ſee above, in *No* 23,) or declaring himſelf to be the *Son of God*; which they, in their Anger, repreſented, by way of Aggravation, as *making himſelf God*

Now in order to underſtand clearly what their Notion was of That *Blaſphemy*, wherewith they charged him for calling himſelf the *Son of God*; it will be neceſſary to conſider the parallel places, wherein the like Accuſation is brought againſt him. *Mark* 2, 7; Upon his ſaying to a ſick Man, *Thy*

Thy Sins be forgiven thee; they anſwer, *Why doth this Man thus ſpeak Blaſphemies? Who can forgive Sins, but God only?* The Blaſphemy they accuſe him of here, was his taking upon himſelf, not the *Perſon*, but the *Power and Authority* of *God*, to forgive Sins. Again; when he was brought before *Pilate*, the Accuſation againſt him was, *Joh.* 19, 7, *We have a Law, and by our Law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf the Son of God.* What they underſtood here by his *making himſelf the Son of God*, and thereby being guilty of *Blaſphemy*, appears from the Account given in the other Three Goſpels, of his Examination before the High-Prieſt in the Council. *St Matt.* 26, 63, *Tell us* (ſaid the High-Prieſt) *whether thou be the Chriſt the Son of God: Jeſus ſaith unto him, Thou haſt ſaid:* [πλὴν λέγω; not, *Nevertheleſs*; but, *Moreover*] *I ſay unto you, Hereafter ſhall ye ſee the Son of Man ſitting on the right-hand of Power, and coming in the Clouds of Heaven: Then the High-Prieſt rent his Clothes, ſaying, He hath ſpoken Blaſphemy,——ye have heard his Blaſphemy.* S *Mark* relates it thus; *ch.* 14, 61, *Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the Bleſſed? And Jeſus ſaid, I am*; *And ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man ſitting on the right-hand &c.* S *Luke* thus; *ch.* 22, 67, They asked him, *ſaying, Art thou the Chriſt?* He anſwered,

Hereafter ſhall the Son of Man ſit on the right-hand of the Power of God: Then ſaid they all, Art thou Then the Son of God? And he ſaid unto them, ye ſay that I am. From theſe places compared together, it is evident, that That which they meant by asking him whether he was the *Son of God*, was to charge him with taking upon himſelf to be *That Son of Man*, of whom *Daniel* had propheſied, *ch.* 7, 13, *I ſaw in the Night-viſions, and behold, one like The Son of Man, came with the Clouds of Heaven, and came to the Antient of days*, [to God the Father,] *and they brought him near before him; And there was given him Dominion and Glory and a Kingdom, that all People, Nations, and Languages ſhould ſerve him; His Dominion is an everlaſting Dominion, which ſhall not paſs away; and his Kingdom, that which ſhall not be deſtroyed.* Our Lord's declaring Himſelf to be *This Son of Man*, the Chriſt, the Son of God, prophecied of by *Daniel*; was the *Blaſphemy*, whereof the Jews accuſed him. And therefore 'tis probable, when they ſaid they had *a Law by which he ought to die*, Joh. 19, 7; they did not mean That Law referred to in the Margin of our Bibles, *Levit.* 24; 15, 16; which threatens Death to him that *curſeth God*, or *blaſphemeth the Name of the Lord*; but rather That Law, *Deut.* 18, 20, which threatens

threatens Death to Him that *ſhall preſume to ſpeak a word in the Name of God*, without being really ſent by him. And accordingly, to This very ſame charge of *Blaſphemy*, (in the place at preſent under our conſideration, *Joh.* 10, 33,) we find our Saviour replying, (not what your Learned Friend would have expected in His Hypotheſis, but) that he was *really ſent from the Father*, ſpake in his *Name*, worked by his *Power*, and was *no Deceiver:* Ver. 32, *Many good Works have I ſhowed you from my Father.* Ver. 36, *Say ye of Him whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the World, Thou Blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* And *ver.* 37, 38, *If I do not the Works of my Father*, [if my Works are not really ſuch, as prove me to be ſent of Cod, and to act by his Power,] *believe me not: But if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the Works; that ye may know and believe, that the Father is in Me, and I in Him.*

Theſe laſt words, [*the Father is in Me, and I in Him,*] are of the ſame import with thoſe fore-going, *ver.* 30, *I and my Father are One.* And the Meaning of Both is fully explained, as by the Whole Scope of our Saviour's Diſcourſe in this place, ſo by thoſe other parallel Expreſſions, *ch.* 6, 56, *He that eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in Me, and*

I in Him, [*even as the Father dwelleth in me, and I in the Father*; So some MSS have it.] Ch. 14 10, *Believeſt thou not, that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I ſpeak unto you, I ſpeak not of my ſelf; but the Father, that dwelleth in me, He doth the Works: Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me; or elſe believe Me for the very Works ſake.* Ver. 20, *At that day ye ſhall know, that I am in my Father, and You in Me, and I in you.* Ch. 15, 4, *Abide in Me, and I in you.* Ch. 17, 11, *Holy Father, keep through thine own Name, thoſe whom thou haſt given me; that They may be One, as We are.* Ver. 21, *That they All may be One, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that They alſo may be One in Us; that the World may believe that Thou haſt ſent me.* Ver. 22, *And the Glory which Thou gaveſt Me, I have given Them; that They may be One, even as We are One.* Ver. 23, *I in Them, and Thou in Me, that They may be made perfect in One, and that the World may know that Thou haſt ſent Me, and haſt loved Them as Thou haſt loved Me.* Ver. 26, *That the Love wherewith thou haſt loved Me, may be in Them, and I in Them.* 1 Joh. 3, 24, *He that keepeth his Commandments, dwelleth in Him, and He in Him.* 1 Joh. 4, 15, *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth*

leth in Him, and He in God. And ver. 16, *God is Love; And He that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in God, and God in Him.*

I conclude This Head with a Paſſage out of *Tertullian*; who, though a *Montaniſt*, and One, who in this very *Book againſt Praxeas* affords your Friend more Citations to his Purpoſe, than are to be found in all the other Writers of the Three Firſt Centuries put together, yet Thus commenteth the Text we are Now upon. *Concerning his Sheep alſo our Lord ſays, that none could take them out of his hand. For my Father, who gave them me, is Greater than All; and* I and the Father are One. *One Thing, he ſays; not One Perſon. For, One Thing, in the neuter Gender, does not expreſs Identity, but Union, Likeneſs, Conjunction, the Love of the Father towards the Son, and the Obedience of the Son to the Will of his Father. When he ſays,* I and the Father are One; *he ſhows that they are Two Perſons, whom he ſo joyns equally together. For the ſame reaſon,*

De ovibus etiam ſuis, quòd nemo illas de manu eius eriperet. Pater enim quod mihi dedit, majus eſt omnibus; &, *Ego & Pater Unum ſumus.* —— Unum ſumus, non, Unus ſumus. —— Unum dixit, neutrali verbo; quod non pertinet ad Singularitatem, ſed ad Unitatem, ad Similitudinem, ad Conjunctionem; ad Dilectionem Patris, qui Filium diligit; & ad obſequium Filii, qui voluntati Patris obſequitur. *Unum ſumus*, dicens, *Ego & Pater*; oſtendit duos eſſe, quos æquat & jungit. Adeò addit etiam multa ſe opera a Patre oſtendiſſe, quorum nihil lapidari mereretur. Et nè putarent ideò ſe illum lapidare debere, quaſi ſe *Deum ipſum*, id eſt Patrem, voluiſſet intelligi; quia dixerat, *Ego & Pater Unum ſumus*; quâ *Filium Dei* Deum oſtendens, non quâ *ipſum Deum*: Si in lege, inquit, ſcriptum eſt, Ego dixi, vos dii eſtis; & non poteſt

he

solvi Scriptura; quem Pater sanctificavit, & misit in mundum, vos eum blasphemare dicitis, quia dixi, Filius Dei sum? Si non facio opera Patris mei, nolite credere; si verò facio, & Mihi credere non vultis, vel propter opera credite: Et scitote quod ego in Patre sim, & Pater in Me. Per opera ergo erat pater in filio, & filius in Patre; & ita per opera intelligimus Unum esse Patrem & Filium. Adeò totum hoc perseverabat inducere, ut duo tamen crederentur in unâ virtute; quia aliter Filius credi non posset, nisi duo crederentur. *Adversus Praxeam. c.* 22.

he adds also that he had shown them many Works from the Father, for none of which he deserved to be Stoned. And least they should think he deserved to be Stoned, as making himself to be God Himself, *that is, the Father; by saying, that He and the Father were One; (by which he meant that He was God as being* The Son of God, *not as being* GOD HIMSELF;) *he therefore adds further, saying; If it is written in the Law, I said ye are Gods, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God? If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not: But if I do, and ye believe not Me, believe me for the very Works sake: And know, that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me. By the Works therefore was the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father; and so we understand the Father and the Son to be One, by the Works. Thus the whole of our Lords Discourse leads us to believe, that though they are One in Power, they are nevertheless Two Persons: Because otherwise it could not be*

be believed there was a Son, if it was not believed there were Two Persons.

Thus also *Novatian: If Christ* (saith he) *had been the Father, as the* Hereticks *imagine; he would have said,* I and my Father Am One, [*Unus*, One Person.] *But* One, *in the Neuter Gender,* [*Unum*, One Thing,] *signifies Agreement of Fellowship, not Unity of Person. So that the Father and Son are* One Thing, *by Agreement and Love. The Apostle* Paul *also takes notice of this Unity of Agreement, with a Difference of Persons.* He that planteth, *saith he,* and he that watereth, are One, [*One Thing.*] *Now every body knows, that yet* Apollos *was One Man, and* Paul *another, and not* Paul *and* Apollos *One and the Same Man.*

Si erat, ut *hæretici* putant, pater Christus, oportuit dicere *Ego & Pater Unus Sum.—Unum* neutraliter positum, societatis concordiam, non unitatem personæ sonat. —— ut meritò Unum sit pater & filius, per concordiam & per amorem. —— Novit hanc concordiæ unitatem & Apostolus *Paulus*, cum personarum tamen distinctione. —— *qui plantat, & qui rigat unum sunt.* Quis autem non intelligat, alterum esse *Apollo*, alterum *Paulum*, non eundem atq; ipsum *Apollo* pariter & *Paulum? cap.* 22.

N° 27.

JOHN XII, 41. *These Things said Isaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of Him.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 597. In the *Answer*, pag. 72.

When

When *Isaiah* in his Vision *saw* the Glory of God, he *foresaw* the Glory wherein Christ was to be revealed: And the *Glory it self* which he Then saw, being the *Visible Image* of the *Invisible God*, was (in the unanimous Opinion of All the Ancient Fathers) the *Son representing* the Person of the *Invisible Father*. See my *Scripture-doctrine*, *Part I.* № 597, & 616.

Against This, (which is very plain and intelligible, as well as the constant Doctrine of the Ancients,) your learned Friend alleges neither Arguments of Reason, nor the Authority of Antiquity. He adds only a *remote* and very *obscure* Discourse, concerning Christ's having a *Name* and *Power* and *Glory* of his *own*, as well as his *Fathers*; which is very *true*, but not to the *purpose*: Concerning a *personal*, but *not real*, difference of Glory; which is a Distinction very *dark and obscure*: Concerning *a Name* derived from the Father with the Person of the Son, referred to in the Form of Baptism; as if, being baptised into the *Name of Christ*, was not being baptised into the *Profession of his Religion*, but into the *Name itself* taken (as they speak) *technically*, *materially*, or *cabbalistically*: Concerning an *Unity of Essence* inferred from an *Unity of Essential Glory*, and an *Unity of Glory* from an *Unity of Essence*; which

which is a part of *Metaphyſicks* very hard to be underſtood, and which the Scripture never meddles with: Laſtly, concerning *Two Perſons* repreſented by *One Glory or Appearance*, (which yet is not the Caſe, but, on the contrary, *One Perſon*'s being the Glory or Repreſentation of *Another*, the *Viſible* repreſenting the *Inviſible*;) which, *he ſays*, 'tis natural to conclude is with this Deſign, that we ſhould believe the *Two Perſons* to be *One Being*; Which, I think, is a manifeſt Contradiction in Terms.

And here therefore at length your Friend joyns iſſue with me. *The moſt remarkable* pag. 74. *thing* (he ſays) *in the Learned Doctor's Note upon the Text, and which I take to be the Key of his whole Book, is his confounding* Individual Being *and* Perſon, *as if they were Terms of the ſame Import; and then ranking thoſe among the Followers of* Sabellius, *who hold the Father and Son to be* One and the ſame Individual Being. Well then: If *a Perſon* be not an *Intelligent Agent*, and an *Intelligent Agent* an * *Individual Intelligent Being*, (which is the common and natural Notion

* Res ſingularis per ſe ſubſiſtens, in rebus intellectu præditis, idem eſt quod perſona: *An individual Thing* [or *Being*,] *ſubſiſting by itſelf*, (ſays the learned Biſhop *Bull*,) *is, in things indued with Underſtanding, the ſame as Perſon.* Defenſ. *Sect.* 2, *cap.* 9, §. 11. See alſo a large Paſſage of *Juſtin*

Notion All Mankind have of *a Perſon*;) will your Friend tell us what *a Perſon*, in His Senſe, is; and what the Scripture means, when it continually repreſents *the Son* to us as an *Intelligent Agent?* Will he tell us what Such *a Perſon* is, which is *no Being*; or how *Modes of Subſiſtence*, mere abſtract Notions, can be *Intelligent Agents*, without having ſo much as any *real Exiſtence* at all? Or, of what Benefit can it poſſibly be, to make Uſe of words which have *no Signification?* Your Friend cannot here reply, that theſe things are a *Myſtery*. For we are not now ſpeaking about the

---

Juſtin Martyr in the latter part of his Dialogue with *Trypho*; where, ſpeaking againſt thoſe, who taught that the Son [ἄτιμον καὶ ἀχώριστον τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν δύναμιν ὑπάρχειν, ὅπερ τρόπον τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φασὶ φῶς ἐπὶ γῆς εἶναι ἄτιμον καὶ ἀχώριστον ὄντος τοῦ ἡλίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὅταν δύσῃ, συναποφέρηται τὸ φῶς] *was only a Power emitted from the Father, ſo as not to be really diſtinct from him, in like manner as Men ſay the Light of the Sun is upon Earth, yet ſo as not to be a real Diſtinct thing from the Sun in the Heavens, but, when the Sun ſets, the Light alſo goes away with it*; he, on the contrary, explains his Own Opinion to be, that *as Angels are permanent Beings*, and not mere Powers, *ſo* the Son, whom the Scripture calls [Θεὸν καὶ Ἄγγελον] both *God and an Angel*, [ἐχ ὡς τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς ὀνόματι μόνον ἀριθμεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀριθμῷ ἕτερόν τι ἐστι,] *is not, like the Light of the Sun, a mere Name* [or Power,] *but a really diſtinct Being, begotten from the Father by his Power and Will; not by Diviſion, as if the Father's Subſtance could be parted, as all corporeal things are divided and parted, and thereby become different from what they were before Part was taken from them; but as One Fire is lighted from another*, [ſo as to be really diſtinct from it,] *and yet the former ſuffers thereby no Diminution.*

Words

Words of *God*, which are the Expreſſions of Scripture; but about the words of *Men*, who can never be commended for ſpeaking myſteriouſly. Not to ſay, that *plain Contradictions* are in reality no more *myſterious* than the *plaineſt Truths*.

We muſt then be content to hear what your Friend, without having any diſtinct Notion of *his own*, what *a Perſon* is; has to object againſt *My Notion* of it, which is the common and natural Notion of All Mankind who never learnt the Jargon of the Schools. Why; " if God *(ſaith he)* pag. 74. " be [ὁ ὤν] *Being*, and *God* be individual- " ly *One*, and *Being* individually *One*; and " the Son, no leſs than the Father, be " *True God*, as has been already proved; " then muſt the Father and the Son be *One* " *and the ſame Individual Being*, that is, " there muſt be *Two Perſons* in *One and* " *the ſame Individual Being*". The *Concluſion*, [*Two Perſons in One and the ſame Individual* Uncompounded *Being*,] is an expreſs Contradiction; and therefore the *Premiſes* muſt of neceſſity be Faulty ſomewhere. And indeed the Fault is very evident. God is not only [θεὸν] *individually One Being*, but alſo [ὁ ὤν] *individually One Intelligent-Agent or Perſon*, as has been ſhown above, *N°* 1. And therefore if the *Son*'s being *True God*, proves him

him to be ὁ ὤν, it will prove him to be, not only the *same individual Being*, but also the *same individual Person* with the Father. Which is more than your Friend intended to infer. And therefore the *Son*'s being *True God*, must not be understood to signify that he is ὁ ὤν, but that He has *True Divinity* (which *False* Gods have not,) communicated to him from Him who is Alone ὁ ὤν. But your Friend proceeds:

pag. 75. "Since (*saith he*) the *One True God* is "but *One individual Being*; and the *Fa-* "*ther* is This *One True God*; the Son, if "he is a distinct individual Being from "the Father, must be distinct from the "*One True God*, that is, be no True God "himself at all; Which is contrary to "1 *Joh.* 5, 20". (And This also is Dr *Wells*'s chief Argument: *Letter to* Dr Clarke, *pag.* 59.) I answer: That passage of St *John*, is not spoken of *the Son*; as I have shown above, *No* 14. But if it was, still it would follow, that *the Son* was *True God*, not by being himself *the Father*, the *Self-existent Being*; but by having *True Divinity* and Dominion communicated to him from Him, as I before said.

No

N° 28.

Acts VII; 30, 31, 32. *There appeared to him—an Angel of the Lord, in a Flame of Fire in the Bush.——And the Voice of the Lord came unto him, saying, I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 616. In the *Answer*, pag. 75.

Justin Martyr and all the Antient Fathers observe upon this place, that the same Person is here stiled both *an Angel* and *God*. From whence they infer, that the Person here appearing was *Christ*, (the *Angel of the Covenant*, Mal. 3, 1; the *Angel of Gods presence*, Is. 63, 9; and *in whom the Name of God* [the Authority and Power of the Father] *was*, Exod. 23, 21;) speaking in the Person of the Invisible Father. Thus *Gen.* 16, 10, *The ANGEL of the Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy Seed exceedingly.* Again, *Gen.* 31; 11, 13, *The ANGEL of God spake unto me in a Dream, saying,——I am the GOD of Bethel, where——thou vowedst a Vow unto me.* And *ch.* 48, 15, *Jacob blessed Joseph, and said; GOD, before whom my Fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the GOD*

which fed me all my Life long unto this day, the ANGEL *which Redeemed me from all Evil, bleſs the Lads.* [And *Rev.* 11; 1, 3, even an *inferiour Angel* is introduced ſpeaking in the Name or Perſon of God; *The* Angel *ſtood, ſaying*;——I *will give Power unto* MY *two witneſſes, &c.*]

What your Friend alleges upon this Head; *viz.* that Chriſt is not excluded from being *the God of the Patriarchs*, (pag. 76;) that Chriſt is *the God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob*, (pag. 76;) that Chriſt is the Perſon who *ſpake to Moſes*, and called himſelf the *God of the Patriarchs*, (pag. 77;) that Chriſt is ſtiled *Jehovah*, in diſtinction from the Perſon of the Father, [which yet may be controverted,] *Gen.* 19, 24, (*pag.* 78;) All This is in no wiſe contrary to any thing I have aſſerted. But then the *Inference* he draws, *viz.* that therefore *the Son with the Father* is the *Neceſſary Being it ſelf*; This, as it is an expreſs Contradiction, ſo it is alſo directly contrary both to the *Text*, and to the Opinion of all the *Antient Fathers:* See my *Scripture-doctrine, Part I, N°* 597 & 616. I ſhall mention here but one place, which expreſſes the Senſe of all the reſt: *The Son*, (ſays the Synod

Synod of *Antioch*,) *is sometimes called an Angel, sometimes the Lord, sometimes God. For it is Impious to imagine that the Supreme God of the Universe, is any where called an* Angel. *But the Angel* [or *Messenger*] *of the Father, is the Son; who Himself is Lord, and God. For it is written;* The Angel of his Great Counsel [or *Covenant.*]

Ποτὲ μὲν ὡς ἄγγελος, ποτὲ δὲ ὡς κύριος· ποτὲ δὲ θεὸς μαρτυρέων. Τὸν μὲν γὰρ θεὸν τῶν ὅλων ἀσεβὲς Ἄγγελον νομίσαι καλεῖσθαι. Ὁ δὲ Ἄγγελος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἐστὶν, αὐτὸς κύριος καὶ θεὸς ὤν. Γέγραπται γὰρ Μεγάλης βουλῆς Ἄγγελος. *Epist. Synodic. ad Paul. Samosat.*

The *only Argument* your Friend alleges for his Opinion in this place, is, that the Name *Jehovah* is *incommunicable to any Being but the True God*, (pag. 79 & 83.) Which is very True, if thereby be meant that it cannot be given to any *False* God. But that it *may be* and *is* given to Him who is the *Messenger* and Representative of the Only True God, (who consequently is Himself *True God*, and yet not *He who upon account of his Self-existence and Supreme underived Dominion is stiled by way of Eminence The One True God*;) is expressly affirmed in the Text, *Exod.* 23, 21, *My Name* (or *Authority*) *is in Him.* [Yet it may perhaps be worth taking Notice of in this place, that though the Name *Jehovah* is in the Old Testament given to That *visible Person*, who appeared as representing the Person of the *invisible God*; yet in the New Testament, where *Christ* appears in

his own Person, That Name [the True Rendring of which, seems to be, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *He which is and was and is to come*,] is never given to him, any more than the Title [παντοκράτωρ] *Supreme over All*; but he is stiled only κύριος and θεὸς, which are the words by which the Septuagint render אדני and אלהים, which they always read and translate instead of the Proper Name יהוה.]

What he further offers upon this Head, (*pag.* 79;) that *the Name Jehovah, or the Divine Virtue of the Name, did not lodge in the Word, as in a distinct Subject, but was the very Word itself*; That (*pag.* 81,) *the Son revealing the Father, is the very Name, and not the bare Subject in which it dwells*; That (*pag.* 82,) *since the Apostle tells us there is none other Name under Heaven (but the Name of Jesus Christ) given among Men, whereby we must be saved*; *and it is certain the Name by which the Church is to be saved according to the Prophecies of the Old Testament, is the Name Jehovah*; *it follows therefore that the Name Jesus, and the Name Jehovah, are One*: All This, is to Me utterly unintelligible.

Page 80. *The Father and the Word* (he says) *are the One Object of Jewish Worship, or the Lord God who is but One*, Deut. 6, 4. But I think the contrary is plain in the Texts now before us; *viz.* that the *Father*

only

only was the Object of the Jews Worship, manifesting himself unto them by his Son, *the Angel of his Covenant.*

Page 81 & 82. *The Son manifesting the Father, is* (he says) *the same Object of Divine Worship to the Christians, as God the Creator was to the Gentiles:——Otherwise the Christians in their New Dispensation, which is a plain Improvement of the State of Nature, would have a Name to trust in, of lesser Efficacy, than the very Gentiles.* As if *Christians* did not trust in *God the Father, the Creator of all things*; as well as the *Gentiles*, who knew him much more imperfectly: Besides that *Christians* have moreover, (whom the *Gentiles* knew not,) an *Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous*, who is their *Saviour, Redeemer*, and *Intercessor.*

Lastly, he sums up his Argument, (*pag.* 82;) *Therefore the Son manifesting the Father, is One with God the Creator, since the True God is but One:* And (*pag.* 83,) *If then Jehovah be incommunicable to any but the True God, and the True God is but One, and Jesus Christ is Jehovah; Jesus Christ is the True God.* To which I answer, as before: Christ is, and is rightly called, *True God*, by having True Divinity and Dominion communicated to him from the Father; not by being (what your Friend's Argument would prove, if it proved any

thing,) Himſelf That Perſon, who Alone is ſtiled in Scripture by way of Supreme Eminence and unoriginate Dominion, *The True God.*

N° 29.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 622 & 623. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 83.

ROM. XIV; 9, 10, 11, 12. *That He* [Chriſt] *might be the Lord both of the Dead and Living.——We ſhall all ſtand before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt: For it is written; As I live, ſaith the Lord, every knee ſhall bow to me, and every tongue ſhall confeſs to God: So then every one of us, ſhall give account of himſelf to God.*

How the Scripture is to be underſtood, when it declares in ſome places that *God will judge the World*, and in others that *Chriſt ſhall judge the World*; appears (I ſaid) from ſuch Paſſages, wherein *Both* are mentioned together. As *Acts* 17, 31, *God hath appointed a day, wherein HE will judge the World in Righteouſneſs, BY that Man whom he hath ordained:* And *Rom.* 2, 16, God *ſhall judge the Secrets of Men* by Jeſus Chriſt.

Your

Your learned Friend alleges, that, not only God will judge the World *by Jesus Christ*, but Jesus Christ himself also is both *Lord* and *God*. I acknowledge, and have shown at large, that he *is* so. But your Friend, not content with This, laboureth further to introduce an unaccountable Confusion of Persons; by arguing, that when *St Paul* says, *ver.* 6, *He that eateth, eateth to the* Lord, *and giveth* God *thanks*; *and He that eateth not, to the* Lord *he eateth not, and giveth* God *thanks*; it *Seems*, and *it is Reasonable* (he thinks) *to Suppose*, that the word, *God*, in each of these Sentences, signifies *Christ*. But This is so directly contrary to the whole Style of the New Testament, that he is not very Confident of his Assertion: And therefore he tells us *it is yet more probable*, if we consider, that when *St Paul* saith of a weak Brother, *ver.* 3[1] of this Chapter, *God has received him*; he afterwards expresses the same thing thus, *ch.* 15, 7, *Christ also has received us to the Glory of God*; "putting *Christ* (says your "Friend) in the place of *God*, as if He "were comprehended in that Name". Whereas indeed, had *St Paul* written *on purpose* to prevent that Confusion of Persons which your Friend here labours to introduce, he could not possibly have expresst himself more *distinctly*, than in these *very*

words; *CHRIST also has received us, to the Glory of GOD.* But he proceeds: What *St Paul* says, *We shall all stand before the Judgment-Seat of CHRIST*; is expressed by *Isaiah* thus, *every Tongue shall confess to GOD*; and immediately after by *St Paul* also himself, *Every one of us shall give account of himself to GOD:* And what follows from hence? why, either that CHRIST and GOD are *one and the same Person*; (which though your Friend seems not to mean, yet he plainly infers it, *pag.* 87;) or else, (which one would think should not be hard to understand,) that giving Account to *Christ, by whom God judges the World*, is the same thing as giving Account to *God, who judges the World by Christ.*

The Passage your Friend here cites out of *Irenæus*, I cannot forbear transcribing; because it is as *directly against him*, as 'tis possible for words to be: *That every Knee* (saith *Irenæus*) *of things in Heaven and in Earth and under the Earth, might bow to Christ Jesus, our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, according to the GOOD PLEASURE of the Invisible Father; and that every Tongue might confess to him.*

Ἵνα χειςῷ Ἰησῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ Θεῷ καὶ σωτῆρι καὶ βασιλεῖ, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ ἀοράτου, πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται αὐτῷ. lib. 3. cap. 10.

N° 30.

HEB. XIII, 8. *Jesus Christ, the same Yesterday, and to day, and for ever.* In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 662.

That the *Person* of Christ, is *the same Yesterday, and to day, and for ever*; is certainly True, but not the Meaning of This Text. For the Apostle is here speaking, not of the *Person*, but of the *Doctrine* of Christ. In the *Answer*, pag. 88.

Of the *Two Arguments* your Learned Friend alleges for understanding these words concerning the *Person* of Christ, the *first* is the *Context* or Connexion of the words. The Apostle in the preceding Verse, incourages Christians to *imitate their own Pastors in the Constancy of their Faith*; *the Object of which was Jesus Christ, who was no Person of a modern Date, but the same Yesterday, and to day, and for ever.* Thus your Learned Friend. But Where now is the Force of This Argument? *Imitate your own Pastors*, because *the Person of Christ is always the same.* The Context, I think, plainly shows the *other* to be the True Sense: *Adhere to the Faith of the Apostles who first instructed you, and be not carried about with divers new Doctrines*; *For the Doctrine of Christ is always One and the* pag. 89.

same,

ſame, and cannot be changed by Men. This is a very Clear, and a very good Argument. I ſet down the Words themſelves, and leave the Reader to judge which is the Truer Interpretation: *Remember* (ſays the Apoſtle) *Them which have the rule over you, who have ſpoken unto you the word of God; whoſe Faith follow, conſidering the End of their Converſation: Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever: Be not carried about with divers and ſtrange Doctrines.*

The *ſecond* Argument your Friend urges, to prove that the *Perſon* of Chriſt is here meant, and not his *Doctrine*; is a new rendring of the Words of the Text, which he thinks ſhould rather be tranſlated thus; *Jeſus Chriſt, yeſterday, and to day, and for ever, He.* For *the Cabbaliſtick Jews* (he ſays) *placed* [הוא *He*] *Among the Divine Names.* As to the *Cabbaliſtick* Men, I acknowledge there is no Arguing with *Them*: For who can fight with a *Shadow?* or who can reaſon with the Phrenzies of a *myſtical Imagination?* But to your *Friend himſelf*, I anſwer; that the Words of the Original cannot poſſibly bear His Tranſlation. For the Word is not [αὐτὸς] *He*, but [ὁ αὐτὸς] *The Same*; Which Two Words, are never put one for the other. And therefore his rendring, in the two Paſſages which he cites out of *Origen*, the Words, Σὺ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, *Thou art He*, inſtead of, *Thou art the ſame,*

pag. 88.
pag. 90.

ſame, was a Defect of Skill in the Greek Language.

N° 31.

MARK XIII, 32, *But of That day and hour knoweth no Man, no, not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father*; [but my Father only, *Matt.* 24, 36.]

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 773. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 94.

I think the Intention of our Saviour in this Paſſage, is to declare, that, as the Father Alone is [Αὐτόθεος] *God unoriginate* and *of Himſelf*; and [Αὐτοαγαθὸν] *The Alone Underived Fountain of Goodneſs*; upon which account it is affirmed in Scripture, that *There is None Good, but One, that is God the Father*, as almoſt All Primitive Writers unanimouſly cite That Text, (*ſee above, N° 1, at the latter End:*) And as He is alſo the Alone Fountain of All *Power*, inſomuch that our Lord ſays concerning himſelf, *The Son can do nothing of himſelf*, Joh. V, 19 & 30: So He is likewiſe the Alone Fountain of All *Knowledge*, inſomuch that no one knows any thing, no not even the *Son himſelf*, but by communication from *Him*.

Your

Your learned Friend differs not much from me here. He owns that *Irenæus* and even *Basil* understand this Text, not of the *Humane Nature* of Christ, but of his *whole Person:* And he explains it thus; that "*the Father is the Fountain of All Knowledge, which is derived to the Son with his Essence*" [that is, with his Being,] "*from the Father.*

N° 32.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 830. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 96.

JOH. XIV, 28. *My Father is Greater than I.*

When any Person affirms Another to be *Greater than Himself*, he must of necessity mean, *Greater than He Himself is in his Greatest Capacity.* Otherwise *Nazianzen's* Observation takes place: *To affirm* (saith he) *that the Father is Greater than Christ considered in his Humane Nature, is True indeed, but of no great Moment: For what wonder is it, that God should be Greater than a Man?*

Τὸ γὰρ δὴ λέγειν, ὅτι τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον νομιζόμενος μείζων, ἀληθὲς μὲν, καὶ μέγα δὲ· τί γὰρ θαυμαστὸν, εἰ μείζων ἀνθρώπου Θεός; *Orat.* 36.

Your Friend has nothing to object against This: But himself fairly interprets the Text

Text thus; *The Father is Greater, as He is Father.* Which being once declared; That which he adds in the next place, that yet *the Divine Nature is the Same in Both*, muſt of neceſſity (if he will ſpeak conſiſtently) be underſtood to mean *ſo the ſame*, as That which is *derived*, can be the ſame with that which is *underived*; and that which is *Begotten*, can be the ſame with that which is *Unbegotten*.

N° 33.

PHIL. II; 6, 7. *Who being in the Form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God*; [Who, though he was in the Form of God, yet did not take upon him to be equal with God, *or*, was not greedy of being honoured as God;] *But made himſelf of no reputation*, [ἐκένωσε, deveſted himſelf of the Glory he before poſſeſt;] *and took upon him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeneſs of Man*, [took upon him the Form of a Servant, *being* made in the Likeneſs of Man.]

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 934. In the *Anſwer*, *pag.* 96.

Your Learned Friend allows the Neceſſity of amending our Tranſlation in this place; and, as to the Interpretation of the Words

Words of the *Text itſelf*, he differs not much from me.

His *Comment* upon it, is nothing but an Inquiry, in eight very dark and obſcure Pages, *what* the *particular Manner* was of Chriſt's deveſting himſelf of his former Glory. The Circumſtances whereof not being revealed to us, 'tis in vain to indeavour to explain them by Philoſophical Conjectures, and uncertain Metaphyſical Speculations. Sufficient it is, that the *Thing itſelf* is revealed very clearly and intelligibly; that That Divine Perſon, who had before appeared as *Lord of All*, exerciſing the Dominion of the Inviſible Father, and being thereby *in the Form of God*; in the fulneſs of time condeſcended, in Obedience to the Good Pleaſure of his Father, and with his own Free Will and Conſent, to take upon him our Humane Fleſh, and appear for our ſakes *in the Form of a Servant*, as a Man of like Infirmities with Other Men, mean and humble and ſubjected even to Death.

N° 34.

COL. I, 15. *Who is the Image of the Invisible God, the First-born of every Creature.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 937. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 104.

Against my Interpretation of This Text, your Learned Friend alleges nothing: But only entertains his Reader with a Collection of strange and (I think) unintelligible Notions, out of certain *mystical Authors*; whose manner of Writing, having no relation to *Reason and Argument*, but depending entirely upon *Imagination only*; there *can* consequently be no such thing as Arguing with them: And therefore I shall content myself with barely transcribing two or three Instances, for the Reader's Satisfaction.

Some of "*the Antients* (he tells us, *pag.* "105,) thought that *David* spoke of the "Production of the Son, in the following "words, *Ps.* 45, 1, *My Heart is inditing* "*a good Matter*, or, *a good Word:* Which "if it be True, it must be concluded, that "*David* considered the Son as Light of "Light, or as the *Word* and *Truth* conceived in the Mind or Heart of the Father: "For so the Heart is used for the Principle of Thought by the Jewish Writers:

"And

" And then it is no wonder that the word " רחש, rendred *Enditing*, was used by the " Prophet, as probably expressing the *ri-* " *sing up of a Thought* in the mind or un- " derstanding Hot with Contemplation. " But again: when the Scriptures speak of " him as the *proper Son of God*, who is " his *proper Father*; it may REASONA- " BLY be concluded, that the *Sacred* " *Writers* considered him as the *Fruit* of " the *Whole* Person and Nature of the Fa- " ther, or as the *Off-spring* of *his Love*; " and therefore expressed his coming forth " by the Term *Generation*, as signifying " the Production of a † Being in the *Pow-* " *er of Love*, of the same Nature and Per- " fections with the Parent;——the Sub- " stantial Fruit and Product of his *Love*, " or of his whole Nature through Love.— " Which if it be True of his *RELA-* " *TIVE Existence, is much more so of his* " *ABSOLUTE and* Eternal". [*What* Relative *and* Absolute *Existence is, I under- stand not: I leave it to the Reader to con- sider.*]

† Yet generally our Author does not allow the Son to be a *Being*.

Page 107, He inquires: " If the Son, " as *Light*, proceeds from the *whole Glory* " of the Father; Is there any reason why, " as Holy, True, Just, Good, Mighty, " Life itself, and True God, he should not " proceed from the *Whole* Holiness, Truth, " Justice, Goodness, Might, Life, and " Godhead

" Godhead of the Father, and be the Fruit " and Off-spring of his *Whole* Nature?" [*Here he talks as if every one of the Attributes of God, were real Beings, or Parts of the Divine Substance.*]

Lastly, He tells us, *pag.* 109, 110, 111, (out of *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus* and *Tatian*, the Antient Founders of *Sabellianism*,) that *God the Father* is *an eternal Mind*; and because an *eternal Mind* can never be supposed to be void of *Thought*, it was *eternally Thoughtful*, or the *Thought co-existent with the Mind:* That this *eternal Thought* came forth as *a Voice, uttered and spoken forth in order to create*; and is *the Son of God:* That since the *Thought* of *such a Mind*, must be *the Off-spring of the Whole Person of God the Father*; therefore the *Thought or Word coming forth to create, must have been as Real and Personal a Subsistence before, as it was after the coming forth*; and *after his coming forth, when he was doubtless a Person*, he was still *the very same Thought, that eternally existed in the Mind of God*; *which evidently infers him to have been a Person before.* Now All This is, in reality, nothing else but playing with the *equivocal* Signification of words. For, of Necessity, *One only* of these *Two* Notions can be True: Either the Term [λόγος, *the Word,*] signifies in Scripture [That λόγος which is first ἐνδιάθετος, and

then προφορικὸς] the *internal Reaſon* of God, and his *external Word ſpoken forth*, repreſented only *figuratively* as a Perſon; and then, in *reality*, it is No perſon at all, but *Chriſt* will be only (according to the *Socinian* way of Explication) a *mere Man*, in whom dwells the *Wiſdom of the Father*; (Which Notion was of old condemned in *Photinus* at the Council of *Sirmium*, and amounts in the whole to the very ſame with the *Sabellian* Hereſy:) Or elſe, on the other ſide, the Term [λόγος, *the Word*,] ſignifies in Scripture a *real divine Perſon* by whom God acts and reveals himſelf to his Creatures, repreſented only *figuratively* as the Word or Wiſdom of the Father; and then, in *reality*, he is not at all [the metaphyſical λόγος ἐνδιάθετος or προφορικὸς] the *internal Wiſdom of the Father*, or *his Word ſpoken forth*, but *the PERSON by whom* the Father's *Commands* are *executed* and his *Wiſdom and Will is Manifeſted and Revealed*; Upon which Account, *his Name is called the WORD of God*, Rev. 19, 13. Your Learned Friend joyns theſe two Notions together; making that which is *literal*, to be at the ſame time *figurative*; and that which is *only figurative*, to be at the ſame time *literal* alſo: Which is a manifeſt Confuſion and Impoſſibility. The *latter* of the Two Notions I now mentioned, is (I think) the more agreeable to the *New Teſtament*.

Teſtament. The *Son of God* is That *Divine Perſon*, by whom the *Wiſdom* of the Father is manifeſted, and his *Will* revealed to all his Creatures; And upon That Account (as I obſerved,) *His Name* (ſays the Scripture) *is called The WORD of God*, καλεῖται ὁ ὄνομα αὐτῦ, Ὁ λόγος τῦ Θεῦ, *Rev.* 19, 13. And if the *Goſpel of St John* was written after the *Revelation*, (as is not improbable;) then the Reaſon of Chriſt's being called *The Word*, or *That Word*, in the firſt Verſe of that *Goſpel*, is the ſame with regard to this paſſage in the *Revelation*; as his being ſo frequently ſtiled in the Goſpels, *The Son of Man*, or *That Son of Man*, is with regard to the perſon ſo ſtiled and deſcribed in the prophecy of *Daniel*, *ch.* 7, 13. Now becauſe the word [λόγος] happens alſo to ſignify, *Reaſon*; hence the Authors your Friend cites, conclude, that Chriſt is *literally* the *Reaſon* or *Wiſdom* of the Father; and, by Conſequence, *no Perſon* at all. There are ſeveral other Paſſages in the New Teſtament, wherein Chriſt is called likewiſe *the Power* and *the Righteouſneſs* of God: Very elegantly and emphatically; becauſe by Him is manifeſted *the Power*, and by him is ſet forth in a moſt conſpicuous manner *The Righteouſneſs* [δικαιοσύνη, צדקה, *The Mercy*] of the Father. From hence the ſame Authors might have

argued, in like manner as in the other case, that *the Son of God* is literally *That Attribute* which is called the *Power*, and *That Attribute* which is called *The Mercy* of God. And by the same Argument that they infer in the other case, that the Father considered distinctly without the Son, would be [ἄλογον καὶ ἄσοφον] a *Being void of Reason and Wisdom*; by the same Argument they might here likewise have inferred, that the Father considered distinctly without the Son, would be *a Being void of Power* and *void of Mercy*. And then all Men would have plainly seen the weakness of their Reasoning.

N° 35.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 998. In the *Answer*, pag. 112.

MATT. IV, 1. *Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the Wilderness.*

In your Learned Friend's Comment upon This Text, there is nothing material wherein we differ. *See above*, N° 33.

N°

N° 36.

LUKE IV, 18. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the Poor.*

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1005. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 114.

Your learned Friend says not a word upon this Text; but only unfortunately cites one passage out of *Irenæus*, upon which he makes a wrong Observation. *Requiescebat Spiritus Dei super Eum*; *The Spirit of God* (saith Irenæus) *rested upon him*, viz. upon *Christ*. "EUM, (says "your Learned Friend,) *the Man, not the* "*Word*". He had forgot, it seems, that he was citing a *Latin* Translation; and that *Irenæus* wrote in *Greek*, in which Both the words [λόγος and ἄνθρωπος] are equally Masculine. But This is of no great Moment: For in the whole passage, he does indeed represent *Irenæus*'s Sense rightly; though he mistook in judging where the Emphasis of the Expression lay,

N° 37.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1056. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 115.

ACTS XXVIII, 25, 26, 27, *Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the Prophet unto our Fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say &c.——and I should heal them.*

The Meaning of This Text, I said, seemed to Me to be This: *Esaias*, by the Revelation of the *Holy Ghost*, saw *God* sitting upon the Throne of his Glory, and heard him saying *Go &c. Esai.* 6; 1, 9. Thus *St John* in the Apocalypse, being *in the Spirit*, (Rev. 1, 10;) saw *God* sitting upon his Throne, and beheld *Christ* in his Glory. And the words which *Christ* himself spake, (*Rev.* ch. 2, *&* ch. 3,) are in the very same Chapters said to be *what the* Spirit *saith unto the Churches.* So here likewise, what Esaias *in the Spirit* heard *God* speaking, is said to be spoken by the *Holy Ghost.* Whatever *God* speaks, may very properly be said to be spoken *by the Holy Ghost*, because *God* always speaks to his Prophets by the Inspiration of his *Holy Spirit:* And whatever is spoken by the *Holy Ghost*, may no less properly be said to be spoken by *God*, because 'tis spoken to the Prophets by *That Spirit* which *God* has

has given them. In the *Revelation*, *ch.* 11, *ver.* 1, 3, even an *inferiour Angel* is introduced as ſpeaking in the Perſon of God: *The* Angel *ſtood, ſaying*; I *will give Power unto* MY *two Witneſſes*, *&c.*

Your learned Friend fairly acknowledges, that the *Glory* which appeared to *Iſaiah*, ch. 6, is the Glory of *the Father*; even the ſame which appeared to *St John*, Rev. 4; 2, 8. But the ſame Glory *(he ſays)* is alſo called the Glory of *the Son*, Joh. 12, 41: How That Text is to be underſtood, I have ſhown above, in my Note upon the place, *No* 27. And the ſame Glory, *(your Friend goes on,)* is, in the place now before us, ſaid to be the *Glory* of the *Holy Ghoſt*: That's very wonderful; for there is not one Syllable about *Glory*, either in the Text or Context. But he adds his *reaſon* for what he affirms; For the *Glory* or *Lord*, *(ſaith he,)* which ſpake to the Prophet, is called here the *Holy Ghoſt*: But That cannot be; becauſe neither in the Old Teſtament nor in the New, is the *Holy Ghoſt* at any time ſtiled *Lord*; but, on the contrary, the Prophets are always repreſented as ſeeing thoſe Viſions by the Inſpiration of the *Holy Ghoſt*, in which Viſions they hear *God* or *the Lord* ſpeaking. However, from hence your Friend collects with *great Probability*, (ſo he expreſſes

himself, much more modestly than many Writers,) the *Unity or Identity of Nature of the Three Persons*. But the Confusion that appears in This Expression, shows there is not That Clearness there should be in his Notion. For though between Two Individuals there may be an *UNITY of Nature*, as Two Men are (ὁμοούσιοι) of the same Common humane Nature; yet Two Individuals cannot, without an express Contradiction, have an *IDENTITY of Nature*; as Two Persons cannot be (ταυτούσιοι or μονοούσιοι) of the same Individual or Identical Nature, because Then One of those Two Persons would be the same Person which the Other of them is.

The Passages he cites out of the Jewish *Rabbies*, (if they prove any thing,) prove either that those Rabbies took the *Holy Ghost* to be only another Title for *God the Father himself*, or else that they understood him to be a Person speaking in the *Name* of God the Father. And if there be any places in the *Scripture itself*, wherein the *Spirit of God* seems to be put figuratively for *God himself*, in like manner as the *Spirit of a Man* signifies the *Man himself*; yet such places do not at all favour your Friend's Hypothesis, but much rather the *Sabellian* or *Socinian* Notion; 'till, by being compared with other parallel places, their True Meaning

Meaning appears to be That which I have already set forth in my Explication of the Text at present before us.

The Texts in the *second and third Chapters* of the *Revelation*, where the *words of Christ* are said to be what *the Spirit saith unto the Churches*, are thus explained by your Friend: *Because* (saith he) *the* One *Glory of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was manifested in the Humane Nature of Christ, though the Word only was personally united to it; are the words of Christ attributed to the Spirit.* To *Me*, the Reason of This Expression [*what the SPIRIT saith unto the Churches*,] seems rather to be This; that 'twas by *being in the Spirit*, (ch. 1, 10,) 'twas by the *Inspiration of the Spirit*, that St *John* saw That Vision, wherein *Christ* was represented as speaking to him those words. Which of these two Interpretations is the more reasonable and intelligible, must be left to the Reader to judge. pag. 122.

The *Testimonies* of Fathers, which your Friend alleges to confirm his Explication of the Text before us, (*SOME Antient Writers*, he calls them;) the Reader must not suppose to be Citations out of *Antient* Writers indeed. For they are only two Writers at the *Latter End of the Fourth Century*. The *more Antient* Writers, always

Ὅταν τὰς λέξεις τῶν προφητῶν λεγομένας ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου ἀκούητε, μὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπνευσμένων λέγεσθαι νομίσητε· ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κινοῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου. [προφητικὸν πνεύματος, ut mox.] Ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ὡς προαγγελτικῶς τὰ μέλλοντα γενήσεσθαι λέγει· ποτὲ δ' ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ δεσπότου πάντων καὶ πατρὸς Θεοῦ φθέγγεται· ποτὲ δ' ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ &c. *Apolog.* 1.

ways speak in a different manner. Thus *Justin Martyr: When in the Writings of the Prophets* (saith he) *you find a Person introduced speaking, do not then think that the things are spoken by the Inspired Persons themselves, but by the Divine word* [the *Prophetick Spirit* he calls it presently after,] *which moves them. For sometimes it* [viz. the Prophetick Spirit] *directly foretells things to come; Sometimes it speaks, as in the Person of God the Supreme Lord and Father of All; And sometimes it speaks, as in the Person of Christ.*

N° 38.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1075. In the *Answer*, pag. 124.

JOH. III, 5. *Except a Man be born——of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*

To be *Born of the Spirit*, is, according to the same Evangelist, to be *Born of God*: It is probable then, (says your learned Friend,) that *God* and the *Spirit* were believed by Him to be *One*. But the Scripture always speaks more distinctly, and without

without any such confusion of Persons. *Rom.* 8; 11, 14, *If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal Bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you:——For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God.* 1 Joh. 4; 12, 13, *God dwelleth in us, and his Love is perfected in us; hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.* This is very distinct and intelligible: But, according to your Friend's Argument, the *Spirit of God* will be the *Spirit of Himself*; Which is hard to be understood.

The Passage of *Nemesianus a Thubunis*, which your Friend cites upon this occasion, is (what He was not aware of) a *Corruption* introduced in the Latin Church into the Text itself of the Verse next following That which we are now upon. *Joh.* 3, 6: *That which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh; and That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit; For God is the Spirit, and such a Person is therefore born of God.* These are the words your Friend cites from *Nemesianus:* But they are indeed (what He did not perceive,) the very words of the Text itself, as it was corruptly read by *Nemesianus* and *Tertullian*, and some other Latin Fathers. *Ambrose*, with some very remarkable

able Circumſtances worth your Friend's Notice, cites the corrupt words a little otherwiſe: For *He* reads the Text in the following manner: *That which is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh; BECAUSE IT IS BORN OF THE FLESH: And That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit; BECAUSE THE SPIRIT IS GOD.* So *Ambroſe* in his Comment underſtands the interpolated words. For Thus he argues: *This place* (ſays he) *ye Arians do ſo expreſsly teſtify to be ſpoken of the Spirit, that ye take it away out of your Copies; And I wiſh ye ſtruck it out of your own Copies only, and not out of the Books of the Church,* [the Church of *Milan.*]—— *And perhaps ye have done the ſame thing in the Eaſt too. But though ye have been able to take away the Words, yet ye cannot take away the Faith.* Theſe words of *Ambroſe* demonſtrate, (quite contrary to what He imagined,) that there had been indeed a Corruption of the Text, not by the Arians *taking away* any words, but by Others (either careleſly, or in the overheat of their Zeal againſt the Arians,) having *added to* the Latin Text, words which

Quod natum eſt ex Carne, Caro eſt; quia de Carne natum eſt; *Et quod natum eſt de Spiritu, Spiritus eſt*; *QUIA DEUS SPIRITUS EST.* Ambroſ. de Spiritu Sancto, lib. 3, cap. 11.

Quem locum ita expreſsè Ariani teſtificamini eſſe de Spiritu, ut eum de veſtris codicibus auferatis: Atq; utinam de veſtris, & non etiam de Eccleſiæ codicibus tolleretis. —— Et fortaſsè hoc etiam in Oriente feciſtis. Et literas quidem potuiſtis abolere; ſed fidem non potuiſtis auferre. *Ibid.*

in

in the Original never were there. And 'tis a ſtrange Inſtance of the *Ignorance* of that great Man, and of the *Latin* Church at that time; to be impoſed upon ſo far, as to receive even into the publick Books of the Church, ſo manifeſt an Interpolation.

N° 39.

MATT. XII, 31. *The Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, ſhall not be forgiven unto Men: &c.* In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1121. In the *Answer*, pag. 125.

By the *Holy Ghoſt* here, was meant (I ſaid) not the *Perſon*, but the *Works* of the Holy Ghoſt: For no reaſon can be given, why Blaſphemy againſt the *Perſon* of the *Spirit* of God, ſhould be more unpardonable, than Blaſphemy againſt the *Perſon* of the *Son* of God, or than Blaſphemy againſt the *Perſon* of *God* [the Father] *himſelf*. But the *Works* of the Spirit, being the greateſt and laſt Means of Conviction that God ever intended to afford Men; the rejecting of Them, was conſequently the Higheſt Aggravation of Guilt.

To this, your Friend replies: *Where This Doctrine*, [that *Blaſphemy againſt God the Father, and the Son of God, are pardonable*,] pag. 125.

ble,] *is to be found, is hard to tell ; The Text does not seem to infer it, nor the parallel places in the rest of the Evangelists.* I answer : 'Tis to be found in the Words immediately going before the Text : *ALL manner of Sin and BLASPHEMY shall be forgiven unto Men* ; [In St *Mark* it is, *All Sins shall be forgiven unto the Sons of Men, and Blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme :*] *But the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto Men.*

pag. 126. But he proceeds : *Blasphemy against the Father* (he says) *is unpardonable, according to* Levit. XXIV, 16, *He that blasphemeth the Name of the Lord, shall surely be put to Death.* I answer : A *Capital* Crime, is one thing ; and what our Saviour says shall *never be forgiven*, is another.

pag. 126. Your Friend replies : *The Jewish Doctors were of another Mind : They had a Tradition among them, that there were certain Crimes, that excluded the Sinners from having Any Portion in the World to come : Among which, was pronouncing the Name Jehovah according to its Letters : Now they looked upon the Egyptian to have cursed God, by such a Pronunciation of the Sacred Name : The Consequence of which is, that his Blasphemy was irremissible in the World to come.* But this their Reasoning was grounded upon

on ſo weak a Superſtition, that he does not think fit to inſiſt much upon it.

He goes on therefore to another Argument: *If Any Crime is unpardonable, Blaſphemy doubtleſs againſt the God of Heaven, or the Perſon of the Father, is ſo; as being an Act of open Defiance and moſt provoking Inſolence.* I anſwer: Though no Crime is, *in its own Nature*, greater than Blaſphemy againſt God; yet a Crime may, upon account of *certain Circumſtances*, become more unpardonable, as being *more remote from Repentance.* Of This Kind is *Blaſpheming the Greateſt and Laſt Means of Conviction*; aſcribing the moſt *beneficial*, as well as moſt *powerful* Works, to an *unclean* Spirit; and thereby taking away all poſſible means of diſtinguiſhing *Good* from *Evil*: Which therefore our Saviour does accordingly in expreſs Words here declare to be *more unpardonable than Any other Blaſphemy whatſoever.* pag. 127.

The Texts he alleges out of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and out of St *John*, are by almoſt All Divines underſtood, not of a Sin *abſolutely unpardonable*, but of a *Sin exceedingly difficult to be amended and pardoned*; namely *Total Apoſtacy from Chriſtianity.* And if it was indeed *abſolutely unpardonable;* yet it would be upon the ſame Account as the Sin in the Text is declared to be ſo; namely, becauſe it is *blaſphemouſly renouncing the laſt Means of Conviction and Amendment.*

No

N° 40.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1132. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 131.

2 COR. III. 17, 18. *The Lord is That Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty.*

But we All with open Face, beholding as in a Glass the Glory of the Lord, are changed into the same Image from Glory to Glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

For the clearer Understanding the True Meaning of these Words, it will be proper to consider the whole Scope of the Apostles Discourse in this Chapter. The Holy Ghost having been poured forth upon the Apostles at *Pentecost* in so very singular and plentiful a manner, as that, *before* that time, it is said comparatively, *not to have been given at all*, Joh. 7, 39; hence St *Paul* in the 8th Verse of this Chapter, elegantly stiles *the Gospel*, by way of Eminence, *The Ministration of the Spirit*. And from That Consideration, through the *Whole* Chapter, magnifies the *Doctrine of Christ*, as being more clear and plain, more powerful and efficacious, more illustrious and glorious, than the Law of *Moses*. *Ver.* 3. *Ye are* (saith he) *the Epistle of Christ, ministred by Us, written not with Ink, but with the*

the Spirit *of the Living God*; *not in Tables of Stone, but in fleshly Tables of the Heart*: That is; The Power and Efficacy of *the Gospel*, is as much greater than that of *the Law*, as can be expreſt by *comparing* that which is written in a *Book*, with that which is imprinted inwardly in the very *Heart and Soul itself*. The ſame Argument he purſues, *ver.* 6, *God hath made us able Miniſters of the New Teſtament, not of the Letter, but of the* Spirit; *for the Letter killeth, but the* Spirit *giveth Life*: That is; The Goſpel gives us thoſe *Spiritual* Precepts, whereof the *Legal* Ordinances were but *Types and Shadows*; and teaches us the way to *eternal Life*, whereas the Rigour of the Law could end only in Mens *condemnation*. And from hence he proceeds to magnify the glorious Manifeſtation of the Goſpel, by comparing it with the Glory that ſhined in *Moſes*'s Countenance; which, though ſo bright that the Children of *Iſrael* could not ſtedfaſtly behold it, yet was but temporary and tranſient, and only a Type or Figure of That permanent Glory of the Goſpel, which was to continue for ever: *Ver.* 7. *If the Miniſtration of* Death, *written and engraven in Stones, was glorious, ſo that the Children of Iſrael could not ſtedfaſtly behold the Face of Moſes, for the Glory of his Countenance, which Glory was to be done away*; *How ſhall not the Miniſtration of the*

Spirit *be rather glorious ? For if the Miniſtration of* Condemnation *be Glory, much more doth the Miniſtration of* Righteouſneſs, (of *Juſtification*, it ſhould be rendred,) *exceed in Glory :——For if That which was done away was glorious, much more That which remaineth* (that which is Perpetual) *is glorious.* And hereupon he takes occaſion elegantly to deſcribe the *Blindneſs* of the Jews after our Saviour's time, in not ſeeing through the Types and Figures of the Old Teſtament ; by comparing it to the *Veil* which *Moſes* put upon his Face to conceal the Brightneſs of it : *Ver.* 14, 15, 16, *Their Minds* (ſaith he) *were blinded ; For until this day remaineth the ſame Veil untaken away, in the reading of the Old Teſtament ; which Veil is done away in* Chriſt : *But even unto this day, when Moſes is read, the Veil is upon their Heart : Nevertheleſs when it* [when the Heart of the People of the Jews] *ſhall turn to the Lord* [ſhall be converted to *Chriſt*,] *the Veil ſhall be taken away :* As he had ſaid juſt before, *ver.* 14, *which Veil is done away in Chriſt.*

And then he ſums up all, and concludes his whole Diſcourſe, in the Words of the Text now before us : *Ver.* 17 ;

Now the Lord is that Spirit.] *The Lord* ; that is, *Chriſt*, *in* or *by whom*, in or by whoſe Goſpel, (he had ſaid, *ver.* 14,) *the Veil is done away* ; and *to whom*, (he had ſaid,

ſaid, *ver.* 16,) *the Jews ſhould be converted:* This Lord, even *Chriſt*, is *That Spirit* which the Apoſtle had been ſpeaking of through the Whole Chapter. His Meaning therefore is: The *Goſpel* or *Doctrine of Chriſt*, is *the Spirit*, the *End and Deſign* of the Law, which giveth *Life*, or ſhows Men the way to *Juſtification*; in oppoſition to the dead *Letter* and to the *Rigour* of the *Law*, which leads only to *Condemnation*. 'Tis that *Spirit* or *final Intent* of the *Law*, which is to continue for ever; in oppoſition to thoſe mere *Types and Shadows*, which were ſoon *to be done away*. 'Tis that *Spirit* or full *Meaning and Signification* of the *Law*, which is oppoſed to the *Veil* of *Ignorance* and *partial Underſtanding* of it.

[*Chriſt*, or *the Goſpel of Chriſt*, is here ſaid to be *the Spirit*; after the ſame manner of ſpeaking, as he is affirmed in other places of Scripture to be The *Way*, The *Truth*, The *Life*, The *Wiſdom or Power of God*, Our *Righteouſneſs*, and the like.]

And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty.] That is: Where this *Miniſtration of the Spirit*, (ver. 8;) this *Manifeſtation of the Truth*, (ver. 2, of the following Chapter,) prevails; where the *Goſpel* is received and embraced; There is *Liberty*. *Liberty*, from the Bondage and Yoke of Ceremonies; *Liberty*, from the

Dominion and Slavery of Sin; *Liberty*, from the Rigour and Terrour of the Law, from the *Miniſtration of Condemnation*, ver. 9, from the *Miniſtration of Death*, *ver.* 7; But moſt immediately, *Liberty* from that *Veil* of *Ignorance and Obſcurity*, which remained upon the *Hearts*, and perplexed the *Underſtandings* of the unbelieving *Jews*, when the Old Teſtament was read to them: In oppoſition to which, the Apoſtle argues, *ver.* 12, that *WE uſe great plainneſs of Speech, and not as Moſes which put a Veil over his Face.*

But We All with open Face.] This is not ſaid *in oppoſition to* what went before, but by way of *Explication of*, or *Inference from*, the Words immediately fore-going. It ſhould not therefore have been rendred [*BUT*,] but [*AND.*] *Where the Spirit of the Lord is*, where the Goſpel prevails, *There is Liberty*; *AND We all*, or, *And Therefore we all*, all true Chriſtians, do *with open Face*, not through an obſcure *Veil*, as did the Jews, *behold the Glory of the Lord.*

With open Face.] That is, *clearly*, *plainly*, and *diſtinctly*: Not in *Types* and *Shadows*, not in *obſcure Glimpſes* and *feint Repreſentations*, not in *remote Hints* and *diſtant Proſpects*; but with a *full and direct* View, an immediate Intuition, as of the *Subſtance* and *reality*, of things *preſent* and *actually*

actually before us. *We* behold the Myſtery of God in Chriſt, *not* as the *Children of Iſrael* ſaw the Brightneſs of *Moſes*'s Countenance *through the Veil*, (which is what the Apoſtle here alludes to;) *but* with *open Face*, as Moſes *himſelf* is deſcribed to have ſeen the Lord, when *the Lord ſpake unto him Face to Face, as a Man ſpeaketh unto his Friend*, Exod. 33, 11.

Beholding the Glory of the Lord.] That is; the Clear and *Glorious* Manifeſtation of the Will of God by the Goſpel. For ſo the Goſpel is ſtiled, *The Riches of Gods GLORY*, Rom. 9, 23; *the Riches of the GLORY of this Myſtery*, Col. 1, 27; *the GLORY as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth*, Joh. 1, 14; *the Light of the GLORIOUS Goſpel of Chriſt, who is the Image of God*, 2 Cor. 4, 4; And *ver.* 6, *The Light of the Knowledge of the GLORY of God, ſhining in our Heart.* The Words of that whole Verſe, are very remarkable: *God, who hath commanded the Light to ſhine out of Darkneſs*, (that is, who manifeſted his Glory *originally* in the *Firſt Creation* of Things,) *hath ſhined in our Hearts*, (that is, hath manifeſted his Glory the *ſecond* time no leſs conſpicuouſly in our *Redemption,*) *to give the Light of the Knowledge of the GLORY of God, in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt.* And theſe two laſt Expreſſions; *Chriſt's* being the *IMAGE of God*;

and the *Light of the Knowledge of God's Glory ſhining upon us in the FACE* (or in *the Perſon*) *of Chriſt*; open to us the Ground and Meaning of that *Similitude*, which the Apoſtle here interpoſes;

Beholding, as in a GLASS, the Glory of the Lord.] That which he hereby intended to expreſs, is; that in *Chriſt*, who is the *Image of the Inviſible God*, and the *Great Revealer of his Will*, we *clearly and plainly* behold the *whole Pleaſure of God towards us*. For *the Father, no Man hath ſeen at any time*; *no Man Hath ſeen, nor Can ſee*; but *the only-begotten Son, which is in the boſom of the Father, He hath declared him*; And hath declared him *ſo plainly*, that *he who hath ſeen M E*, ſaith our Saviour, *has ſeen the FATHER*, Joh. 14, 9. There is a Phraſe very *like* to this in the Text before us, uſed in a *contrary* Senſe by the ſame *Apoſtle*, 1 *Cor.* 13, 12, *Now we ſee through a GLASS darkly, but Then Face to Face.* In which Paſſage; *ſeeing THROUGH a GLASS*, ſignifies ſeeing *darkly* or *obſcurely*, in *oppoſition* to beholding *plainly, Face to Face*: But here, in the preſent Text, *beholding as IN a GLASS*, ſignifies on the contrary, *ſeeing clearly or plainly*; and is the *very ſame* as, *beholding Face to Face.* The Words in the Original, are in Both places more expreſſive, than in the Tranſlation; and ſhow plainly the Reaſon

of

of This different Signification. In *One* place, the Word, which we render, *Glaſs*, ſignifies a *Perſpective-glaſs*, [βλέπομεν δι' ἐσόπτρου;] which brings diſtant things into the Reach indeed of our Sight, but ſtill very *obſcurely*, *imperfectly*, and *indiſtinctly*; and does therefore very elegantly, and by a moſt proper Similitude, expreſs That *View* of a Future State, which we have by *Faith* and not by Sight. But now in *This Other* place, the Word which we render, *Glaſs*, [κατοπτριζόμενοι:] ſignifies a *Mirroir* or *Looking-glaſs*, which on the contrary repreſents things *plainly and diſtinctly*, *Face to Face*; and therefore no leſs elegantly repreſents that clear *Light of the Knowledge of the Glory* and Will *of God*, which *ſhines* to us (ſaith the Apoſtle) *in the FACE of Jeſus Chriſt.*

Are changed into the ſame Image.] That is: As *Chriſt* is, by Nature, the perfect *Image* of God; ſo *We*, by communication of *Light* and *Knowledge* from him, and by the Practiſe of *Righteouſneſs* and true *Holineſs* in Obedience to him and Imitation of him, are transformed *into the ſame Image.* As *Chriſt* is, by Nature, the *Son of God*; ſo *We*, by *Adoption* and by the *Fruits of the Spirit dwelling in us*, have *This Love beſtowed* upon us, that *We* alſo *ſhould be called The Sons of God:* For *of his Fulneſs have we all received, and Grace for Grace,*

Joh. 1, 16. See *Rom.* 8, 29; *Ephes.* 4, 23; *Col.* 3, 10; *Rom.* 12, 2; *Joh.* 17, 22; 1 *Cor.* 15, 49; *Col.* 3, 4; *Phil.* 3, 21; & 1 *Joh.* 3, 2.

From Glory to Glory.] That is: Either, by Communication of Glory to *Us*, from the Glory of *Christ*; according to that expression of our Saviour, *Joh.* 17, 22, *The Glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given Them*; and that of the Evangelist, *of His Fulness have we all received*: Or else, the Phrase may signify, *from one Degree of Glory to another*; In like manner as *Ps.* 84, 7, *They shall go from strength to strength*; And *Rom.* 1, 17, *Therein* [in the Gospel] *the Righteousness* [or Mercy] *of God is revealed from Faith to Faith*; from one degree of Clearness of Revelation, to another; from a less clear Dispensation under the Law, to a clearer one under the Gospel.

Even as by the Spirit of the Lord.] That is, (if the words be rightly thus rendred;) All these things are accomplished in such a manner, in so wise, so effectual, so glorious a manner, as becomes the Dignity of the Great Agent, and are worthy the Operation of the Spirit of God. But the words [καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος] may no less properly be rendred, *as by the Lord who is the Spirit*; namely by *Christ*, who in the fore-going verse is affirmed to be *That Spirit* the Apostle was speaking of, in the Sense which

which has been before explained. Which of the Two, is the Truer Interpretation of these last words; must be left to the Learned Reader to judge.

Your learned Friend, contends for quite another Interpretation of this whole Text; and thinks that the word, *Lord*, in the 17th verse, signifies not *Christ*, but the *Holy Ghost*: So that when the Apostle says, *The Lord is That Spirit*, his Meaning will be, *The Holy Ghost is that Spirit.* The reasons he gives for this Interpretation, are very *dark and obscure*; and make the whole Text very intricate, by a strange Confusion of Persons. That the word, *Lord*, in that place, cannot possibly signify the *Holy Ghost*, is (I think) very evident from the following considerations.

1. The whole Scope and Connexion of the Apostles Discourse from the beginning of the Chapter to the End, is very clear, natural and elegant, according to the Explication I have given of it above; taking the word, *Lord*, in the 17th verse, to signify *Christ*, according to the general style of the New Testament. Whereas, according to your Friends interpretation, the whole is made intricate and obscure, by a confused Transition from one person to another.

2. The Context immediately going before and following, necessarily determines the

the word, *Lord*, in the 17th verſe, to ſignify *Chriſt*. For in the 14*th verſe*, the Apoſtle had ſaid, that the *Veil* of ignorance, which is upon the *Heart* of the unbelieving Jews when the old Teſtament is read, *is done away in Chriſt*, that is, is removed when by believing the Goſpel they are inſtructed rightly to underſtand the typical expreſſions in the old Teſtament. In the 16*th verſe* he repeats the ſame Senſe again in theſe words, *When it* [the Heart of the People of the Jews] *ſhall turn to the Lord, the Veil ſhall be taken away:* To *turn to the Lord*, that the *Veil* may be taken *away*; evidently means, *being converted to Chriſt*, [or embracing the Goſpel,] *in* or *by* whom, he had ſaid juſt before, *the Veil is done away*; And therefore when he goes on, *ver.* 17, *Now the Lord* ——; it is moſt manifeſt that the word, *Lord*, muſt mean that very ſame Lord, who is ſpoken of in the 16*th verſe*, and who in the 14*th verſe* is expreſsly called *Chriſt*. Wherefore 'tis very wonderful your learned Friend ſhould affirm, (*pag.* 134,) *that Nothing occurs in the whole Context to determine* the word to this *Senſe*; when the very words *immediately fore-going*, do by moſt neceſſary and evident conſtruction ſo determine it. And as to the words *next following*; far from *confirming* your Friends Interpretation, as he ſuppoſes; they alſo evidently ſhow it to be

be impoſſible to be true: For when the Apoſtle adds, *Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty*; if the word, *Lord*, in the fore-going words, had ſignified the *Holy Ghoſt*, then the *Spirit of the Lord* would here have been as much as if he had ſaid, *The Spirit of the Holy Ghoſt*, or *the Spirit of the Spirit itſelf*; which is manifeſtly impoſſible.

3. Laſtly; Were there no other Argument, it would be ſufficient to allege, that your Friends underſtanding the word, *Lord*, in this place, to mean the *Holy Ghoſt*; is entirely contrary to the whole Language of the inſpired Writings, and tends to introduce the utmoſt confuſion. For neither in the Old, nor in the New Teſtament, is there any one place, where the *Holy Ghoſt* is ever ſpoken of under the Title of *Lord*, but always diſtinctly under his own proper perſonal Denomination, *the Spirit of the Lord*, or *the Spirit of God*, or *the Holy Spirit*. There are only Two Places (and thoſe your Friend ſeems not to have been aware of,) wherein *Baſil*, contrary to all the Writers in the Ages before him, underſtands the word, *Lord*, to mean the *Holy Ghoſt*. The One is, 1 *Theſ.* 3; 12, 13, *The* LORD *make you to increaſe and abound in Love,* —— *to the end he may ſtabliſh your Hearts unblameable in Holineſs before* God even our Father, *at the coming of our* Lord Jeſus

Jesus Christ. The Other Text is, 2 *Thes.* 3, 5, *The* LORD *direct your hearts into the Love of* God, *and into the patient waiting for* Christ. But how *weak* a thing it was in that Father, to think the Word, *Lord*, in these Texts, signifies the *Holy Ghost*; may appear by comparing these Texts with That other passage, 1 *Cor.* 1; 7, 8, wherein the Name *Jesus Christ* is expressly added to the Appellation, *Lord*, in *Both* parts of the Sentence: — *Our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall also confirm you unto the End, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

N° 41.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1211. In the *Answer*, *pag.* 136.

MATT. XXVIII, 19. *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

How This Text was universally understood in the Primitive Church, cannot be doubted; there being still extant a *professed Paraphrase* upon it, even the *Apostles Creed*; which from the earliest times of Christianity, was, with very little Variation in the several Churches, the *Baptismal Creed*, or *Profession of Faith*, which all Christians were taught on Purpose that they might

might understand what it was they were Baptised into.

To be baptized therefore *in the Name* [or, *into the Name*, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα,] *of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; is, to be baptized into the Profession of our Belief,

In *One God, the Almighty Father*, [πατέρα παντοκράτορα, Supreme over All,] *the Maker of Heaven and Earth*: And

In *One Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God*, who was *incarnate*, and *died for our Sins*, and *rose again for our Justification*, and *now sitteth at the right Hand of God to intercede for us*, and *shall come again at the End of the World to judge all Men according to their Works*: And

In *the Holy Spirit of God*, the *Inspirer of the Apostles and Prophets*, the *Comforter of good Christians*, and the *Sanctifier of all Hearts*.

Nothing can be more præposterous, than, instead of thus comparing this Text with the antient Baptismal Creed, and with other Texts of Scripture; to reduce, on the contrary, the Words both of the Text and of the Creed, to the Standard of New Scholastick Hypotheses.

Your Learned Friend says nothing at all upon this Head, but barely alleges *Two Passages* out of Antient Writers: *Neither* of

of which, have any the leaſt relation to This Text; And *One of them*, is only a ſpurious *Latin* Sentence of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who wrote in *Greek*. If it was genuine, there is nothing very remarkable in it: But what Regard is to be had to ſuch *Latin* Scraps of *Greek* Authors, the Reader may judge from the very laſt Sentence of the Book, [*Quis Dives &c.*] to which This Fragment is annexed. For, the concluding Words, [ὧ ἅμα τῷ παιδὶ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ, ᾧ ἅμα ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, ἔπη δόξα,] *To whom, THROUGH his Son Jeſus Chriſt, and through the Holy Spirit, be Glory*; are in the Latin Tranſlation thus rendred, [*Cui cum Filio Jeſu Chriſto,*] *To whom, WITH his Son Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. And the like Tranſlations are to be found in almoſt every Page of the *Latin* Verſions of *Greek* Fathers.

N° 42.

In the *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 1248. In the *Anſwer*, pag. 137.

1 JOH. V, 7. *For there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe Three are One.*

I obſerved that theſe words could not have any ſtreſs laid upon them in Any Controverſy;

troverſy; *Firſt*, becauſe in the Original the natural ſignification of the words, *theſe three are One*, is, that they *are One agreeing Teſtimony*; (as very many Orthodox Divines among the Moderns, both *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, freely acknowledge:) And *Secondly*, (which is much more material,) becauſe the Whole Text itſelf does not appear with any Certainty to have ever been found in Any Manuſcript Copy of the Original Greek at all.

The Learned Dr *Mills* alleges indeed, that the Text has been found in *One Manuſcript in England*, in *ſeveral of the moſt Antient Manuſcripts in the Vatican Library*, and in *Seven of Robert Stephens's Manuſcripts*: But a Judicious Reader will eaſily perceive, that *Every One* of theſe are *Miſtakes*.

How the Miſtake aroſe concerning *Stephens's* Manuſcripts, I have ſhown at large in my Letter to Dr *Wells*, pag. 43; and Dr *Mills* himſelf fully acknowledges it, in his *Prolegomena*, pag. 117.

As to the *Manuſcript in England*, it is only a Book mentioned by a *Foreigner*, but which no Man *in England* ever heard of. And *Eraſmus* himſelf, who is the only perſon that mentions it, declares at the ſame time, that he did not believe there was any ſuch thing.

Concerning

Vaticani antiquissimi & emendatissimi aliquot, ad quos Hispani Theologi ediderunt Testamentum *Complutense*, in *Quo* habetur hæc pericope.

Concerning the *Vatican* Manuscripts, Dr *Mills*'s words are these. *Several most antient and most correct Manuscripts in the Vatican Library, according to which the Spanish Divines published the* Complutensian *Testament, in which* [viz. in which Printed Testament, *not*, in which Manuscripts] *this verse is found.* Now, besides that Dr *Mills* himself observes, that the Text is wanting in That most antient *Vatican* Copy, from which *Sixtus Quintus*'s Septuagint was published; and that no body else could ever find in the *Vatican* Library *Any* MS which had this Text, (as appears from *Caryophilus*'s * various Lections collected by

---

*Totus septimus versus hujus Capitis desideratur in 8 MSS Codicibus Græcis. Sed quia citatur —— *a Cypriano*, —— & ab *Athanasio* in *Disputatione cum Ario Nicææ habitâ*, his verbis, Ἰωάννης φάσκει, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἕν εἰσι, idcircò versus integer in Textu Græco relictus est, juxta VERITATEM LATINÆ VULGATÆ editionis, & IMPRESSOS etiam Codices Græcos. *Caryophili variæ Lect. ad finem Catenæ in Marc.*

i. e. *The whole seventh Verse of this Chapter* (saith Caryophilus) *is wanting in Eight Greek Manuscripts. But because 'tis cited by* Cyprian, [which I have shown to be a Mistake,] *and by* Athanasius *in his Disputation with* Arius *at* Nice, [which is a spurious Book, and cites not this Verse neither,] *in these Words*, John saith, and these Three are One; *therefore the whole verse is kept in the Greek Text* [of Caryophilus's intended Edition,] *according to the TRUTH of the Vulgar LATIN Edition, and also the PRINTED Greek Copies.*

Note:

by order of Pope *Urban* the Eighth; and as *Eraſmus* has ſhown in his Note on the Text, and in his Controverſy with *Stunica*; who, though himſelf concerned in the *Complutenſian* Edition, yet alleges not againſt *Eraſmus* Any Greek Manuſcript, but appeals from the Greeks to the *Latins* and to *Jerom*:) an unprejudiced Reader would preſently gueſs from the marginal Note in the very *Complutenſian* Edition itſelf, that the Editors put in this Text upon the Authority of *St Thomas Aquinas*, who knew no Greek; and not from their *Vatican* Manuſcripts.

Note: The *Eight* Greek Manuſcripts, in which *Caryophilus* ſays This Text was wanting, were ALL the Copies which had This Epiſtle in them. For ſo he tells us in his Preface; [Conquiſitis juſſu Sanctiſſimi Domini noſtri Urbani VIII, MSS codicibus venerandæ Antiquitatis, è Vaticanâ potiſſimùm;—— evangeliorum, decem; Actorum & Epiſtolarum omnium, *OCTO*; Apocalypſeos, quatuor;] *I collected*, ſaith he, *by the command of our moſt Holy Father, Pope Urban the Eighth, Manuſcript Copies which were of the moſt venerable Antiquity, particularly out of the* Vatican *Library*; *of the Goſpels, Ten Copies*; *of the Acts and all the Epiſtles*, EIGHT *Copies*; *of the Revelation, Four.*

'Tis alſo very obſervable, that in a Collection of various Readings from Sixteen Manuſcripts, Eight of which were out of the King of *Spain*'s Library, there is no mention made of This Text; though it was a Collection of ſuch Readings, as moſt favoured the *Vulgar Latin*, in order to correct the *Greek* Text by the Rule of the *Latin*. [*Variæ Lectiones* Marchionis Veleſii, Petri Faxardi, *factâ collatione* ſedecim *exemplarium, in quibus erant Octo ex bibliothecâ Regiâ beati Laurentii.*——*Plurimæ illarum favent impensè interpretationi* Vulgatæ *noſtræ.* —— *Magno labore comparatæ ſunt a Viro Sapientiſſimo, & emendatus Græcus Textus ad* Normam Vulgati *Interpretis.*] De la Cerda Adverſaria Sacra, cap. 91.

Add to This, that the Text is wanting in all the *Antient Verſions*; and moreover is never cited in the genuine Works of any Greek Father, either during the Time of the *Arian* Controverſy, or before or after that time; though many of them cite the words both immediately fore-going and following this Text.

pag. 137. All This, your learned Friend (like a very fair and reaſonable Adverſary) readily allows. But then, as "it ought not (*ſaith* "*he*) to be concealed, that This paſſage "does not certainly appear to have been "found in the Text of *any Greek* Ma-"nuſcript; ſo it ought alſo to be told, "that it appears to have been found in "the old *Latin Verſion* that was uſed in "the *African* Church: Elſe how could "*Cyprian* and *Tertullian* have cited it?" I anſwer: Dr *Mills* ſhows, that the old Latin Verſion had it not: And therefore neither *before Cyprian*'s time, nor for a long time *after*, was it cited by *Latin* Writers, any more than by *Greek* ones. *Tertullian*'s words, [*Qui tres Unum ſunt*,] are plainly the words of that Author himſelf, and not a Citation of This Text. The Author of the Book, *de Baptiſmo Hæreticorum*, (allowed to be contemporary with *Cyprian*,) cites *St John*'s words, agreeably to the *Greek Manuſcripts* and the *Antient*

ent Verſions, thus: *St John teaching us in his Epiſtle concerning our Lord, ſaith:* "*This is He who came by* "*Water and Blood, even Jeſus Chriſt: Not by Water* "*only, but by Water and* "*Blood*; *And 'tis the Spi-* "*rit which beareth Witneſs,* "*becauſe the Spirit is Truth: For there* "*are Three that bear Record, the Spirit,* "*and the Water, and the Blood*; *and theſe* "*Three agree in One*". In which Paſſage 'tis obſervable, that not only the whole 7th Verſe, (as Dr *Mills* takes notice,) but the words (*in Earth*) in the 8th Verſe, are omitted alſo: Which muſt be underſtood to be the Caſe, in moſt Books that want the 7th. From this manner of reading the Apoſtles words, both *before*, *in*, and *after Cyprian*'s time, it is very improbable that *Cyprian* alone ſhould have found the 7th Verſe in *His* Copies. The Queſtion then is; How comes *Cyprian* to ſay, *It is written concerning the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit*; *theſe Three are* [*Unum*] *One*? Of This, we have a clear Account given us by *Facundus*: *John the Apoſtle* (ſaith he) *in his Epiſtle thus ſpeaks concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghoſt*; There are

Ait enim Johannes de Domino noſtro in epiſtolâ ſuâ nos docens, *Hic eſt qui venit per aquam & ſanguinem, Jeſus Chriſtus*; *Non in aquâ tantùm, ſed in aquâ & ſanguine*; *& Spiritus eſt qui Teſtimonium perhibet, quia Spiritus eſt veritas. Quia tres teſtimonium perhibent, Spiritus & Aqua & Sanguis*; *& iſti tres in unum ſunt.*

Joannes Apoſtolus in Epiſtolâ ſuâ, de Patre & Filio ac Spiritu ſancto ſic dicit; *Tres ſunt qui teſtimonium dant in terrâ, Spiritus, Aqua, & Sanguis*; *& hi tres unum ſunt.*

In Spiritu significans *Patrem*, ——in Aquâ verò *Spiritum Sanctum*,——in sanguine verò *Filium*.——Quod *Joannis* Apostoli testimonium B. *Cyprianus* Carthaginensis Antistes & Martyr, in Epistolâ sive libro quem de Trinitate scripsit, de *Patre* & *Filio* & *Spiritu Sancto* dictum intelligit: Ait enim, *Dicit Dominus, Ego & Pater Unum sumus; & iterum de Patre & Filio & Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, Et hi tres Unum sunt.* Lib. 1. Defens. tr. Capit.

Three that bear Record in Earth, the Spirit and the Water and the Blood; *By the Spirit, meaning the* Father; *by the Water, the* Holy Ghost; *and by the Blood, the* Son. *Which Testimony of the Apostle St* John, *the Blessed* Cyprian *Bishop of Carthage, and Martyr, in his Epistle or Book which he wrote concerning the Trinity, understands to be meant of the* Father, *the* Son, *and the* Holy Ghost: *For thus He writes*; Our Lord saith, I and my Father are One; and again, Concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost it is written, And these Three are One: *Thus Facundus.* The Testimony of *Fulgentius* usually alleged on the other side, proves only that the Text of the 7th Verse began to come into the Latin Copies in *His* time, about the Beginning of the Sixth Century; which yet *Facundus*, who lived nearly at the same time, never heard of.

Thus have I gone through your Learned Friend's Book; not in the manner He went through mine, choosing out a *Few* of my Texts to discourse upon, and leaving the Rest untouched; but I have considered *All* the Arguments He alleged, and in the same Order

Order that He alleged them; without omitting any thing he offers, that Any Reader can think of importance.

I received at the ſame time a *Second* Reply from Dr *Wells*; wherein he ſo wholly refers himſelf to other Modern Authors, whoſe Arguments I had fully obviated in my Firſt Book; and forbears entring Himſelf into the Merits of the Cauſe at all; and writes moreover in ſo particular a Style, and Manner; that I am perſwaded a Man of *Your* Candour and Fairneſs, and that underſtands True Reaſoning ſo well as *You* do, will not think me under any Obligation to have any further Controverſy with *Him*.

I am,

SIR,

Your Affectionate Friend

and Humble Servant,

SAM. CLARKE.

AN ANSWER TO THE REMARKS OF THE AUTHOR OF,

Some Considerations concerning the Trinity, and the Ways of managing that Controversy.

By *SAMUEL CLARKE*, D. D.
Rector of St *James's Westminster*, and
Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty,

LONDON,

Printed for *James Knapton*, at the *Crown* in St *Paul*'s Church-Yard. 1714.

AN ANSWER TO THE REMARKS &c.

AFTER the fore-going Papers were finiſhed and ready for the Preſs, there came out a Book entituled, *Remarks upon Dr* Clarke's *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, by the Author of Some Conſiderations concerning the Trinity, and the Ways of managing that Controverſy.* In which, though, after the moſt careful Examination, I could find little more than a Repetition of the ſame Objections which I had already anſwer'd in the fore-going Papers; yet becauſe thoſe Objections were again ſet forth to particular Advantage, by the Skill of a *very Able and Learned Writer*, and by being propoſed with a *reaſonable and good Spirit*, I thought it proper to lay them before my Reader briefly, with the reſpective Anſwers to them.

In

In the *Firſt* place, I obſerve in general, that This Learned Author alleges *only ſome FEW Texts* in *Favour* of his Hypotheſis, and takes no Notice at all of the *greater part* of thoſe *much more numerous Texts* which are directly *Againſt* it; Not ſo much as *attempting* to ſhow, how theſe latter Texts can be reconciled with his Hypotheſis: And yet at the ſame time he is ſo candid as to declare concerning the Method *I* took, that "*the trueſt way of underſtanding the meaning of Single Texts relating to the preſent Controverſy, is to conſider them ALL together in one view*".

Pag. 113.

Secondly, I obſerve that All his Arguments through his whole Book, if they were concluſive, would prove directly, that the *Son of God* is *God the Father himſelf*; and conſequently that Chriſt Our Mediatour is only a mere Man, in whom God the Father dwelt after an extraordinary manner: From whence it follows, that all the Worſhip paid in the New Teſtament to Chriſt our Mediatour and Interceſſour, is either directed to God the Father dwelling in him, (which is ſuppoſing the Supreme Father to *mediate* and *intercede* with himſelf;) or elſe it is directed only to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, (which is no leſs contrary to this learned Authors Hypotheſis.) He complains that he *did not fully comprehend* My

Pref. pag. 1. and *Remarks p.* 3.

My *whole Scheme*: In what part of *My* Scheme, there is *Any* Difficulty of being underſtood, I am not yet aware; But This, I am ſure, is an *obvious*, and, I think, an *unſwerable* Difficulty in *His*.

But to proceed to *Particulars*.

OBJ. *He objects* (Pref. pag. 2; and Remarks, pag. 92,) *that Dr Clarke ſuppoſes* 'the 'Divine Nature ſupplied the place of the 'Humane Soul in Chriſt.

ANSW. On which ſide ſoever That Queſtion be determined, it makes no Alteration at all in *My* Scheme. And therefore, to avoid all needleſs Difficulties, I neither affirmed nor ſuppoſed any thing, which will not hold equally true upon Either Hypotheſis. His inferring from theſe Words in my 38th Propoſition, [*the Divinity of the Son was perſonally and inſeparably united to the Fleſh,*] that I denied *Chriſt* to *have a Humane Soul*; is a wrong Inference, unleſs the ſame can be inferred alſo from the like Words of St *John*, *The Word was made FLESH*; and of St *Paul*, *was manifeſt in the FLESH*; and of St *Peter*, *Chriſt has ſuffered for us in the FLESH*; and from *his OWN* Words, (pag. 98,) *Chriſt's appearance in the FLESH.* pag. 92.

OBJ.

pag. 3. OBJ. 'It is very consistent with Charity and Truth, to rank Dr *Clarke* in 'SOME Arian Class; *because* in five and 'fifty Propositions there is but One Expression, which any of those who now 'profess themselves Arians, would refuse to 'subscribe to.

ANSW. It is easy to demonstrate, that this Suggestion is by no means reasonable or well-grounded. The *Body of Christians* in the *Primitive* Ages, kept stedfast to that Form of Sound Words, the Baptismal Creed; which contained nothing in it, but what both *Arians*, and almost all *other Sects* whatsoever, were forced to acknowledge was the true and undoubted Doctrine of Christ: Is it from hence reasonable to suggest, that the Christian Church in the Primitive Ages was justly to be ranked under Some *Arian* Class, or under any Class of any other Sect whatsoever? This Learned Author will not suspect that it was. *He* therefore only is an *Arian*, who himself maintains, or imposes upon others, the *particular Doctrines* of *Arius*; Not he, who desires to adhere to those *Antient and Scriptural Forms of Sound Words*, which being from the Beginning unanimously received in the Catholick Church, had afterwards different Additions made to them by Men of different Sects and different Opinions, whereby endless Disputes were brought into the Church.

But

But after all, What is *being ranked in SOME Arian Claſs?* Nothing but a Name of Diſlike, without Any determinate Signification. Should *I* affirm, that This Learned Writer might with Truth and Charity be ranked in *SOME Socinian Claſs*, I think I ſhould by no means act well in ſo doing: And yet *His* Scheme is *leſs different* from the Notions of *Socinus*, than *Mine* is from thoſe of *Arius*.

OBJ. 'Three Divine Beings——muſt 'needs be conceived as Three Gods, not- 'withſtanding any Subordination of the 'Second and Third Being to the Firſt; or 'elſe we muſt free the Pagan World from 'the Abſurdity of Polytheiſm, and the 'Guilt of Idolatry; theſe being generally, 'if not always, founded upon a Subordina- 'tion of many Deities to the One Su- 'preme. *pag.* 8.

ANSW. The Difference between *Chriſtianity* and *Paganiſm*, is This. The Pagans acknowledged *many FALSE* (fictitious) *Gods*, and *many FALSE* (fictitious) *Lords*: On the contrary, *Chriſtians* acknowledge only *One TRUE God*, and only *One TRUE Lord* or *Mediatour*. *There are* (ſaith St Paul) *that are called*, (that is, there were feigned by the Heathens,) *Gods many, and Lords many*; *But to Us* [Chriſtians,] *there is but One God*, [viz.] *the Father, Of whom* 1 Cor. 8, 5.

whom are all things; *and One Lord*, [viz.] *Jesus Christ*, *By whom are all things*. Now to say, that besides the *One True God*, there cannot be also *One True Lord* or *Mediatour*; is an Argument, not against *my* Scheme in *particular*; but 'tis the Argument which *Deists* use, (with what reason, I have elsewhere shown,) against Christianity in *general*. Or to say, that there *is* also indeed *One True Lord* or *Mediatour*, but that That One True Lord is the same Individual with the *One True God*; What is This, but to affirm in other words, that *the One Lord*, *Jesus Christ*, *BY whom are all things*, is the *One God*, *the Father*, *OF whom are all things?* Which is overturning the Apostles whole Argument, and introducing an absolute Confusion of Persons. Our *One God*, says the Apostle, is *the Father:* If then the *One Lord*, *Jesus Christ*, be *That One God*, whom the Apostle defines to be *the Father*, *of whom are all things*; is not this expressly affirming that the *Son* is the *Father?* Than which, nothing can be more hard to understand, or to reconcile with the whole Doctrine of Scripture.

But why must Three Divine Beings, of Necessity be conceived as Three Gods? *One God*, *the Almighty Father*; and *One Lord*, *the Only-begotten Son of That Almighty Father*; and *One Holy Spirit of God*, *the Spirit of That Almighty Father*; are in our *Creed*

Creed repreſented to us as *Three diſtinct Agents:* And yet they are no more *Three Gods*, than they are *Three Almighty Fathers*, which is (according to the Creed) the Definition of *God*. *One God*, to whom Mediation is made; and *One Mediatour*, making Interceſſion for us to That One God, (which is St *Paul*'s manner of ſpeaking;) are no more *Two Gods*; than an *Advocate with the Father*, and *the Father with whom that Advocate is*, (which is St *John*'s manner of expreſſing the ſame thing,) are *Two Fathers*. One *Spirit*, One *Lord*, One *God and Father of all, who is above all*; are by the Apoſtle repreſented to us, as *Three diſtinct Agents:* And yet they can no more truly be ſaid to be *Three Gods*, than *Each of them ſingly*, (or than *All of them together*,) can be truly ſaid to be *The God and Father of All, who is Above All*; Which is the Apoſtles Definition of the *One* Supreme *God*. Three perfectly *co-ordinate*, and *equally Supreme Perſons* or Agents, (whatever *Diſtinctneſs*, or whatever *Unity* of *Nature* be ſuppoſed between them,) muſt of Neceſſity be conceived to be *Three Gods*, that is, *Three Supreme Independent Governours of the Univerſe*; becauſe the proper Notion of *God* in *Scripture*, and in *natural Reaſon* alſo, as to all *moral and religious* Regards, is his being abſolutely ὁ παντοκράτωρ, *Supreme Ruler over All*, and

and ὁ πατὴρ πάντων, (Eph. 4, 6,) the *Father or Author of all things:* But, *This Character* being preserved entire, no *other* Power whatsoever ascribed or communicated to other Agents or Persons, can justly cause us to conceive *more Gods* than *One.* How and in what Sense the *Son,* though he be not That *One God and Father of All, who is above All,* may yet truly and properly be stiled *God*; has been largely explained in the fore-going Papers.

But now on the other side, if the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be conceived to be All but *One* Individual *Being*; it follows of Necessity, that the Son and Holy Spirit have *no Being at all*; Which is an *insuperable* Difficulty in This learned Authors Scheme. For if each of these Characters belong to One and the same Individual Being; and the Father Alone be (as is acknowledged) That *Whole Being*; it follows evidently that the Son and Holy Spirit, either are Themselves *The Father*, (which he is not willing to allow;) or else have *no real Being*, *no Existence* at all, but can only be *Modes*, *Powers*, *Characters* or *different Denominations* of That One Supreme, that One Simple and Uncompounded Being, which is the *Father of All.* The plain Consequence of which is, that our *Mediatour and Redeemer* is only a *Mere Man*, in whom *God the Father* manifested himself

himſelf after an extraordinary manner; and that the *Holy Spirit* is nothing but a mere *Vertue or Operation* of the Father. Which Notion, how much ſoever it may be defended, as an Hypotheſis, by bare *Reaſon*, (as may be ſeen in the *Socinian* Writers;) yet I can by no means ſee how it is to be reconciled with what is taught in *Scripture*. Beſides: Since this Learned Writer always ſuppoſes his own Scheme, to be the ſame with That which from the Time of the *Fourth Century* has been ſtiled *Orthodox*; it deſerves to be remarked on the contrary, that by his plainly making the Son to be, not ὁμοούσιος, but ταυτόσιος with the Father, that is, *One and the ſame Individual Being*; his Aſſertion in reality appears to be the ſame with That, which from before the days of *Photinus* to the Times of the *Schoolmen*, has by the Council of *Nice*, and all following Councils been condemned as *Heterodox*.

OBJ. 'If the *Power &c*, of the Son and 'Spirit, be itſelf the *Power &c*, of the 'Father; then——Dr *Clarke* muſt be ob- 'liged to own, that Father, Son and Holy 'Ghoſt, are only Three Names of God; 'becauſe there is no other Perſonal Di- 'ſtinction allowed of by him, but that of 'Three Denominations, or Three B E- 'I N G S. pag 9 & 10.

ANSW. That is to say: If the *Authority* by which the only Son of a Monarch administers his Fathers Kingdom, is itself the Authority of his Father, and not another Authority; *then* the Father and his Son are but One and the same Person under Two Denominations; there being no other Personal Distinction conceivable between them, but that of their being Two Men. The Argument is *exactly* the same in every part.

pag. 11. *OBJ.* 'Whatever is Eternal, must enter 'into our Notion of God: — Could Matter 'be Eternal, I should conclude it belonged 'to the Nature of God.

ANSW. Length of *Duration*, makes no Alteration in the *Nature* of any thing. *God*, is not only *Eternal*, but *necessarily and independently so.* Had *Matter* been produced by the *eternal* Operation of the *Will and Power of God*, it would not thereby have been a whit more *Necessary or Independent*, than it is when produced by the *temporary* Operation of the same *Power and Will.*

pag. 11. *OBJ.* 'There may be Emanations *Ne-* 'cessary, though not indeed Self-existent, 'from the One Self-existent Being.

ANSW. This, (besides that it is not well consistent with this Learned Author's *own* Hypothesis concerning *Individual* Being,) can

can very hardly be cleared from being a Contradiction. For whatever proceeds from any Being, otherwiſe than by the *Will* of that Being; doth not *in Truth* proceed from *That Being*, but from ſome *other Cauſe* or *Neceſſity*, extrinſick to and independent of That Being. *Neceſſary Agents* are *no Cauſes*, but always *Inſtruments* only, in the hand of ſome other Power. For which reaſon, the Antient Fathers both *before* and *after* the Council of *Nice*, do almoſt unanimouſly aſſert, that the *Son* was *begotten* of the *Father*, not by *Neceſſity of Nature*, but by the ineffable *Power of his Will*: As I have ſhown at large in my *Scripture-Doctrine*, *Part* II, §. 17. See alſo above, *pag.* 113.

OBJ. 'Whatever is IN ANY MAN- *pag.* 11.
'NER eternally derived from the Self-
'exiſtent Being, — muſt be Neceſſary.

ANSW. Not, if it be derived by his Eternal *Power and Will.*

OBJ. 'Every thing that is, muſt be ei- *pag.* 11.
'ther God himſelf, or be MADE by
'him.

ANSW. It has generally been thought very Orthodox to ſuppoſe, that ſomething may be BEGOTTEN of Him, which yet nevertheleſs will not be He himſelf, of whom it is begotten.

pag. 11. *OBJ.* 'There can be no middle Beings, 'between the Creator, and the Creature.

ANSW. This, if it be true, proves evidently the Impossibility of this learned Writers own Scheme. For, *the Creator* signifying (in Scripture-phrase) *the Father of all things*, who *created all things by his Son*; if now there cannot possibly be any thing *between* the *Supreme Father of All things*, and That System of Beings which we call *The Creature*; it will of Necessity follow, that the *Son of God* must be either the *Supreme Father himself*, or else a *mere Creature*. To avoid this consequence, he is forced to suppose (*pag.* 129,) that the *Son* is something more than a *mere Name*, and yet not a *real distinct Being*; that is to say, that he is something between *a Being* and *not a Being*: Which is an undeniable Contradiction. I cannot but wonder, so learned a Writer should complain of *My* Scheme, for being *what, after the most diligent Perusal, he cannot fully comprehend*; and at the same time set up One in opposition to it, which of Necessity terminates either in a *manifest Contradiction*, or else in a Doctrine which of all others has always been esteemed the *most Heterodox*.

pag. 12. *OBJ.* 'The *Nature* of That Being, who 'is Self-existent, may be communicated; 'though

'though the *Character* of Self-existence 'cannot: Which is no more than to say, 'the Nature of the Father may be communicated, though the Paternal Character 'and Relation cannot.

ANSW. *Self-existence* is not an *External and Relative* Character, as *Paternity* is; but 'tis an *intrinsick*, *absolute*, and of all others the most *essential Quality* of the Substance or Being to which it belongs. If therefore the *Character* of Self-existence cannot be communicated, it follows necessarily, that neither can the *Nature* of the Self-existent Being, (properly and strictly speaking) be communicated; Self-existence being the principal *Constituent* of That Nature, or That which makes it to be That Nature which it is.

OBJ. 'Self-existence—is not properly the 'Nature of God, nor a primary Attribute 'of his Essence; but only a Mode of Subsistence, applicable to all the Attributes of 'God, as well as to the Divine Nature in 'general. The Knowledge and Power of 'the Father, are Self-existent as well as 'his Nature; and therefore, by the Doctor's 'way of reasoning, cannot be communicated, any more than the Self-existent Nature can. *pag.* 12.

ANSW. *Self-existence*, and *Existence it self*, properly belong to *Substances*, not to

Powers or Attributes. Self-existence therefore is *a primary*, nay *The primary* and *most essential Attribute* of the *Divine Substance.* The *Knowledge* and *Power* of God, are not properly said to be *Self-existent*, but to be Attributes of Him who is himself Self-existent. The reason why the *individual Knowledge* or *Power* of God, cannot be communicated any more than his *individual Existence*, is because they are *individual*; and nothing that is *individual*, can ever be communicated from any one thing to another. Could the *individual Knowledge* of *God*, or the *individual Knowledge* of a *Man*, be communicated to another; there would be no Knowledge left in Him, from whom it was communicated. But the World well understands what is meant by Communication of *Knowledge*, *Power*, and the like: Could this learned Writer show as well how *Self-existent Nature* [or *The Self-existent Nature*] can be communicated, without an express Contradiction; this would be of great importance to him indeed.

pag. 13. *OBJ.* If, by Self-existent, be meant Necessarily-existent, 'then the same thing 'may be affirmed both of the Son and Holy 'Ghost; and consequently Self-existent, in 'This Sense, can be no peculiar Character 'of the Father.

ANSW.

ANSW. The contrary to This, I have shown above, *pag.* 113 & 227, and in my *Scripture-Doctrine*, *pag.* 280; both from Reason, and also the almost unanimous consent of all the Antient Fathers.

OBJ. 'Tis evident to every sincere Reader of Scripture, — that the word, *God*, is applicable to the Son and to the Holy Ghost in the *same* Sense as it is to the Father;——there being no one Expression in the whole Bible, that is apt to mislead a common Reader in this matter. *pag.* 14.

ANSW. What Ground there is for this Assertion, and how little there is indeed in Scripture to mislead a common Reader in this matter, may appear from hence; that the *Holy Ghost* is *not once* in the whole Scripture stiled either *God* or *Lord* at all; that *the Son*, in the very same places wherein he is stiled *God*, is said to be *With God*, and to have been anointed by *His God*; but the *Father*, is stiled by way of Eminence, ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, *God Supreme over all*, the *Lord God Almighty*, the *One God*, the *Only God*, the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, He that *Sends* and *Gives* his *Son* and his *Holy Spirit*; And, in more than three Hundred places, wherein he is joined with the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* in one and the same Sentence, he is stiled *absolutely*

lutely, and by way of Contradistinction, *GOD*.

pag. 15. *OBJ.* 'Did the Israelites *worship* Moses, 'because the Lord said unto him, I have 'made thee a *God* unto Pharaoh?

ANSW. *Honour* or *Worship* is always due in *proportion* to the *Authority and Power*, the *Dominion and Dignity*, of the *Person* to whom it is paid: And where there is *no proportion* between the *Dominion* or *Dignity* of Two Persons at any time compared together, there is also consequently *no proportion* between the *Honours* due to them. The *Israelites* honoured *Moses*, as being what he *was*, not as being what he *was not*: They honoured him, as a *Servant*, not as the *Son*, of God: as a *Man* authorized from God to lead the People, not as being *himself a Divine Person*. Christians likewise worship *Christ*, as being what he *is*, not as being what he *is not*: They worship him as being the *Son* of God, not as being *God the Father himself*: They worship him, according to his *real Powers and Attributes*, as being That Divine Person, who having been originally in the *Form of God*, voluntarily *took upon himself the Form of a Servant*, and was *therefore highly exalted of God*, and had *a Name given him above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow*, [every thing should be subject

ſubject to His Dominion,] *of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth*; *and that* [accordingly, in acknowledgment of That Dominion,] *every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is* LORD, *to the Glory of God the Father*, Phil. 2, 9.

OBJ. 'The SAME Attributes which *pag.* 16. 'diſtinguiſh the True and Only God from 'every thing elſe that is called God, are 'EVERY WHERE in Scripture ap- 'plied to the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, in 'the SAME manner as they are to the 'Father.

ANSW. Not only not EVERY WHERE, but indeed not ſo much as in ANY ONE PLACE of Scripture, is Any One of theſe *diſtinguiſhing* Characters, viz. The *One God*, the *Only God*, the *Lord God Almighty*, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, with others of the like import, ever given either to the *Son* or to the *Spirit*; but they are Always uſed as Synonymous to the *God and Father of All*, or the *God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt:* As I have ſhown at large in the fore-going Papers, and in my *Scripture-doctrine*, by citing every one of the Texts in particular, wherein Any of theſe Terms are uſed.

OBJ.

pag. 18. *OBJ.* The Father's being 'in the Highest, Strict, and Proper Sense, absolutely 'Supreme over All; and his being, absolutely speaking, the God of the Universe; 'are Titles expressive of *Abstract Metaphysical* Attributes, which *never* occur in the 'Sacred Writings, and have *no Relation* 'to Us.

ANSW. To be *Supreme absolutely over all*, is the English of the word παντοκράτωρ; which *does occur* often in the Sacred Writings, and *has relation to Us* and to all Creatures. To be, *absolutely speaking, the God of the Universe*, is the English of θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, *the God and Father of All, who is above All*; which *does* also *occur* in the Sacred Writings, and *has Relation to Us* and to all Creatures. And they are not *abstract metaphysical Attributes*, but Attributes which express *relative Dominion and Power*, which are the Foundation of *Morality and Religion* towards *God our Supreme Governour*. Whence this learned Writer could be led into so strange a Mistake, I cannot imagine.

pag. 19. *OBJ.* 'The Notion of God was fully 'settled both by Scripture and Reason, be-'fore the Doctrine of a Trinity was re-'vealed.

ANSW.

ANSW. The Notion of *God*, so settled, was this, that He is the *Father and Lord of All Things, the Author and Governour of the Universe*. In which Notion, the revealed Doctrine of the *Trinity* has made no Alteration, nor made any other Addition to it but this, that the *same God*, the *same Father and Lord of the Universe*, is now made known to us to be also in a particular and eminent manner, *the Father* [or *the God and Father*] *of our Lord Jesus Christ*. This Observation therefore proves the direct contrary to what the learned Author alleged it for.

OBJ. 'The God of the Jews, is likewise the God of the Christians;——and 'where-ever the word, God, is used in the 'New Testament, it is used in the same 'Sense that it had in the Old. pag. 22.

ANSW. This Observation proves also directly the contrary, to what it is alleged for. For the God of the Jews, the *God of our Fathers*, (as St *Peter* stiles him, *Acts* 3, 13,) is the same who in the New Testament is stiled the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. And therefore unless the *Three Persons* can be said to be the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, neither can they be said to have been *The God of the Jews*, That *God of our Fathers*, who (St *Peter* tells us in the place now cited) *glorified his Son Jesus*.

OBJ.

pag. 23: *OBJ.* 'In all the Passages of the New 'Testament, where mention is made of the 'One or *Only God*; or where the Word *God* 'is used *absolutely*, without any Title at all 'annexed; or where the Word *God* is men- 'tioned with some *High Title*, *Epithet* or '*Attribute*; (excepting only the Title of '*Father*, or some other Word that implies 'a relation to the Son or Spirit,) we are not 'to understand the Person of the *Father*; 'but the *Divine Nature* absolutely taken, 'without any regard to the personal Distin- 'ctions of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. '——And it is begging the Question, to 'apply all these Texts to the Person of the '*Father*, where *God* is mentioned *absolute- 'ly*; because the Question is, whether the 'same *God* who is here mentioned, is not '*Son* and *Holy Ghost* as well as *Father*.

ANSW. There are in the New Testa- ment *many* places, wherein it is expressed at length; ὁ θεὸς, ὁ πατὴρ, *God, namely the Father:* And there are *many more*, wherein, though the Word *Father* is not expressed, yet by the Construction (as this Learned Author himself acknowledges,) the Word *God* is of necessity determined to signify the *Father* only, because contradistinguished (in the Words of the Text itself) from the *Son* or *Spirit*. The Texts of *this sort*, in the New Testament, are more than 300, as they stand collected in my *Scripture-doctrine*.

But

But now on the other ſide, where the Word *God* is by the Conſtruction neceſſarily determined to ſignify either *two Perſons* or *three*, there is *no one Text* to be found. Which then of theſe Two, is begging the Queſtion? To ſuppoſe that the Word *God*, when it occurs *abſolutely*, is to be underſtood in the Same Senſe, wherein it is acknowledged that of neceſſity it muſt by the Conſtruction of the Text itſelf be underſtood in *more than* 300 *other places* of the ſame Book? Or, to underſtand it in a Senſe, wherein there cannot be ſhown to be any Ground for underſtanding it in *Any One Text?* Beſides: if the Word *God*, which always ſignifies an *Intelligent and Powerful Agent*, were ever made uſe of in Scripture to ſignifie what this Learned Author calls the *Divine Nature*, viz. the *whole Three Perſons*, who are *each of them* alſo in Scripture always ſpoken of as *Intelligent Agents*; it would follow unavoidably, that the *Divine Nature* was a *Fourth Intelligent Agent*, diſtinct from, and conſtituted of, thoſe Three Intelligent Agents. Which is the utmoſt Confuſion imaginable.

OBJ. 'Had Chriſt ſhown himſelf to 'the World, with all the ſame Divine Cha- 'racters which the Scripture aſcribes to 'him, but without the relation of *Son*; 'we muſt then have concluded that the 'Godhead *pag.* 36.

'*Godhead* dwelt in him truly and fully; ——*even That Godhead*, '*which was* manifested (*Rom.* 1, 20,) by the things that 'are seen.

ANSW. The plain Consequence of This is, that Christ would have appeared only as a *mere Man*, in whom *God the Father* manifested himself after a miraculous manner.

pag. 38. *OBJ.* 'If Christ is to be directly *worshipped* with any Divine Honour or Worship *whatsoever*, I must conclude from 'hence, that He is *The One Supreme God*; 'because there is no *Kind* or *Degree* of *Worship* to be paid to any other.——As to pag. 40. 'all other Beings, we are ignorant of 'their Nature, we cannot tell the extent 'either of their Knowledge or Power, and 'we know nothing at all of their Intercourse with us; And consequently we are 'not able to judge *what Honour* is due to pag. 42. 'them.—— If no Worship was to be paid 'to Christ upon Earth, how can we suppose him a more proper Object of Worship in Heaven? —— Every Act of *Worship*, *Honour*, or *Respect*, which is paid by 'Man to any other Being besides Man, necessarily implies That Being to be *The* pag. 43. '*One Supreme God*.—— If God commanded us to worship any other Beings below 'him, —he would at the same time reveal to

'us

'us the Nature and Perfections of thoſe
'Beings, and acquaint us with the Manner
'and Degree of Worſhip due to them. We
'ought certainly to know *what ſhare* they
'have under him in the Government and
'Direction of our Affairs; which way our
'Addreſſes may be communicated to them;
'and what Aſſurance we can have of their
'being received and anſwered.—— There
'is not the leaſt Ground from Scripture,
'for any ſuch Diſtinctions as Primary and
'Secondary Worſhip.—— Suppoſing there- *pag.* 44.
'fore Chriſt to be God, and not *The One*
'*Supreme God*; in what Manner muſt we
'worſhip him? and in what Reſpects will
'the Worſhip paid to him, differ from that
'we pay to the One Supreme God?

ANSW. All This is argued, juſt as if the New Teſtament had never been written. For the following Texts, without any Comment, are a *direct* and *expreſs* Anſwer to every part of this Objection.

All Power is GIVEN unto me in Heaven and in Earth. Matt. 28, 18.

The Father judgeth no Man, but hath COMMITTED all Judgment unto the Son. Joh. 5, 22.

Theſe Texts expreſly *reveal* to us, *what Share Chriſt has under the Father, in the Government and Direction of our Affairs.* The following Texts ſhow as expreſly, *what Kind*

Kind and Degree of Worship is to be paid to him, *and upon what Accounts.*

The Father hath committed *all Judgment unto the Son: That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath SENT him.* Joh. 5; 22, 23.

God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name; that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, [every thing should be subject to his Dominion,] *of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth; And that* [accordingly, in acknowledgment of That Dominion,] *every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, TO THE GLORY OF GOD, THE FATHER.* Phil. 2; 10, 11.

When he bringeth in the FIRST-BEGOTTEN into the World, he saith, And let all the Angels of God WORSHIP him. Heb. 1, 6.

Unto him that loved us and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests unto God and his Father, [τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, unto HIS God and Father;] *to Him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever, Amen.* Rev. 1; 5, 6.

Fell

Fell down before the Lamb, ſaying,—— Thou art worthy ——; For Thou waſt SLAIN, and haſt redeemed us TO GOD by thy Blood;—— and haſt made us UNTO OUR GOD, Kings and Prieſts. Rev. 5; 8, 9, 10.

Saying with a loud Voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was SLAIN,———: And every Creature which is in Heaven and on the Earth,—— heard I ſaying; Bleſſing and Honour and Glory and Power be unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne, [*viz. unto* the Father;] *and unto the* Lamb [ſtanding in the midſt of, *or* before the midſt of the Throne, *chap.* 5, 6,] *for ever and ever.* Rev. 5; 12, 13.

Salvation to our God which ſitteth upon the Throne, *AND to the* Lamb. *Rev.* 7, 10.

In all theſe Texts here is a *Worſhip* paid to *Chriſt*, either as *God*, or as *Man*. If it is paid to him as *God*, yet it is not as *Supreme*; becauſe it is expreſsly ſaid to be *TO the Glory of God the Father*, and *FOR his having redeemed us to His God and Father*. But if it be paid to him as *Man*; then it is *ſtill more* directly contrary to this learned Authors whole Hypotheſis expreſſed in This Objection.

pag. 44 & 45. *OBJ.* 'Unoriginated and *abſolutely* 'Supreme,—are Metaphyſical Attributes 'which we *never meet with in Scripture*, 'and which are *never made uſe* of by Men 'in their *Addreſſes* to God.—— Chriſt is 'to be honoured and worſhipped as the 'One Supreme God, whatever becomes of 'thoſe perſonal Diſtinctions of unoriginated—— and abſolutely Supreme.

ANSW. *Abſolutely Supreme*, is not a *metaphyſical*, but a *relative* Attribute. And it is *Often met with in Scripture*; For it is the proper Engliſh of the Word, παντοκράτωρ. And it is *Always made uſe of by Men in their Addreſſes to God*; For, both in the Creed and in Prayers, it is that which is meant by the Word, *Almighty*; which is an imperfect rendring of the Word, παντοκράτωρ. And to ſay that *Chriſt is to be worſhipped as the One Supreme God, whatever becomes of the perſonal Diſtinction of Supreme*; is ſaying that *Chriſt is to be worſhipped as the One Supreme God*, though the *Father Alone* be *Supreme*: Which is an expreſs Contradiction in Terms.

pag 45. *OBJ.* 'If Chriſt be our Maker, our 'King, and our Judge; if he knoweth all 'our Thoughts, and can anſwer all our 'Prayers:—— The ſame Worſhip is to be 'paid him as to the *God over all*, the *ab-*

'*ſolute*

'*ſolute Supreme God of the Univerſe*;
'EXCEPTING only the Uſe of THESE
'and THE LIKE EXPRESSIONS.

ANSW. That is to ſay: The SAME Worſhip is to be paid him, EXCEPTING only that it is NOT THE SAME.

OBJ. 'How does it conſiſt with our 'Notion of the One Supreme God,—— 'that he ſhould ſet up another inferiour 'Object of Worſhip, when he allows us to 'addreſs ourſelves upon all Occaſions IM- 'MEDIATELY TO HIMSELF, and He 'is able to do more abundantly for us than 'any other Being, though never ſo per- 'fect? *pag.* 45.

ANSW. This is indeed the chief Objection, which *Deiſts*, (with *what reaſon*, I have elſewhere conſidered,) bring againſt *Chriſtianity* in general. But how it can be urged by ſuch as believe there *is* alſo *One Mediatour* appointed by God, as well as that there is *One God to whom Mediation is made*; I underſtand not. For if the Argument concludes at all, it concludes that there neither *is* nor *can be* any ſuch thing as a *MEDIATOUR*.

OBJ. 'There ſeems to me to be great 'reaſon to ſuppoſe the humane Soul of 'Chriſt to have exiſted before the World. '——*And ſince* We have no diſtinct No- *pag.* 47.

'tion of any Perfections BETWEEN those 'which belong to GOD, and those which 'he hath imparted to MAN; therefore 'tis very possible that a Human Soul might 'be so formed, as to be more perfect than 'Any Angel.

ANSW. The Creation of a *Human Soul*, before the Creation of the World, before the Creation of *Human Kind*; is a mere Fiction without any Ground. A *Human Soul* formed more perfect than Any Angel, is a *Human Soul* created of a *Higher Species than Human*. The Notion itself, if it is at all intelligible, is perfectly the *Arian* Notion: The only difference is, that That which the *Arians* call a *most excellent Created Spirit*, is here stiled, much more improperly, a *Human Soul*. And to say *we have no distinct Notion of any Perfections BETWEEN those which belong to GOD, and those which he hath imparted to MAN*; is an Objection which (I humbly presume) needs no Answer.

pag. 49 & 50. *OBJ.* 'If the only reason of worship-'ping Christ, be, that the θεότης of the Fa-'ther, his Divine Power, Dominion, Dig-'nity, Authority and other Attributes are 'communicated to him;——there is no '*Occasion* to multiply either Natures or 'Persons, but Christ may be esteemed as 'mere Man exercising the Power of God.

ANSW.

ANSW. The *Reasons* of worshipping Christ, are those which are assigned in the *Texts* I just now cited. And the Question is not, what *OCCASION* we may fancy we have, to multiply either Natures or Persons; but, what the Scripture does *in fact* reveal to us concerning that Matter.

OBJ. If the Honour of Christ is founded upon This only, that 'the Father manifests 'his Glory in and by the Son plenarily and 'WITHOUT MEASURE: It may 'be objected, HOW shall we then be able 'to *distinguish* between the Father and the 'Son; when all that we know of either, is 'by what is manifested of them? pag. 51.

ANSW. We are taught to distinguish them by This; that Christ every where *DECLARES* himself, not *to Be the Father*, but to *come forth from him*, to be *sent by him*, to *speak by his Authority and Commission*; to do nothing *OF Himself*, but every thing by the Power of *the Father*; nothing *TO his own*, but every thing *to his Father's Glory*.

OBJ. 'This Notion, [*viz.* that *Christ* 'was the *Visible Person who under the Old* 'Testament represented the *Invisible God*,] 'it must be owned, was a Notion that 'some of the Fathers had; But they did 'not argue from it the same way that our pag. 53.

'Modern Writers concerning the Trinity 'do.

ANSW. [*Our Modern Writers,*] is a Phrase of uncertain Signification. But that the Antient Fathers argued from this Notion *the very same Way* that *I* did, I proved by *many express Testimonies* in my *Scripture-doctrine*, N° 597 & 616. That they argued from it *that Other way* which this Learned Author supposes, he does *but suppose*, because he thinks they *should* so argue; But he cannot allege *one Testimony* to prove they *did* so.

pag. 53. *OBJ.* 'If these words, [*Exod.* 23; 20, '21, *Behold, I send an Angel before thee;*— '*obey his Voice, for my Name is in him,*] 'were the words of God the *Father*; then 'God did not *always* speak *by his Son* in 'the Old Testament. If they be the words 'of *Christ*, then the *Angel* there sent by 'Him, was the *Person in whom the Name* '*of God was*; and the *God, whose Name* '*was in Him, was* Christ.

ANSW. The words are spoken by *God the Father:* Not that the *Invisible God and Father of all* appeared, (whose *shape* no Man hath *seen* at any time, nor *heard* his Voice;) but the *Father* spake by his *Son*; that is, the *Son* spake *in the Person* (or as the *Representative*) of the *Father:* And the *Angel* there mentioned, is the *Son himself.* It is the

the ſame manner of ſpeaking, as occurs in All Writers, when Any One is introduced ſpeaking as the *Repreſentative* of Another, and mentioning *Himſelf* (as Grammarians ſpeak) *in the Third Perſon.* There is no great Difficulty in the Expreſſion; and yet *Mr le Clerc* (in his Notes upon the Place) urges it as an unanſwerable Difficulty juſt in the ſame manner, though not with exactly the ſame view, as this Learned Author has here done.

OBJ. 'Is it poſſible for us to imagine, 'that——all the Antient Patriarchs—— 'ſhould be miſtaken in their Notions of 'God; and that God himſelf ſhould lead 'Mankind into this Miſtake, by allowing 'the *Son* to take upon him the Style and 'Character, and to accept the Honour and 'Worſhip that belonged to the Father 'only? *Pag.* 54.

ANSW. The Jews and Patriarchs were under no Miſtake in this matter. For they worſhipped, not the *Son*, but *the Father.* The *God* whom the *Jews* and *Patriarchs* worſhipped, St *Peter* ſtiles (*Acts* 3, 13,) the *God of Abraham and of Iſaac and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers:* And *This God*, he ſays, *glorified his Son Jeſus.* If then *Jeſus* was the *Son* of *the God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob*; it follows neceſſarily that *the God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob*, was

the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. And if so; then the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, was not *the Son*; unless the *Son* was the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*: Neither was the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, the whole *Three Persons*; unless the whole *Three Persons* were the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. 'Tis True, the Person which appeared *visibly* to the Patriarchs, representing the *invisible God and Father of All*, was the *Son*: But then he is therefore called, both in the Old Testament and in the New, the *ANGEL of the Lord*: And in Him appeared the Glory of *The Invisible God*, whom the Patriarchs worshipped. If this was not the case; then it will follow of necessity, either that the *Invisible Father* himself appeared *visibly*, and was stiled an *Angel of the Lord*, Acts 7, 30, and elsewhere; Which I presume this Learned Author will not affirm: Or else it was an *ordinary Angel* which said to *Moses*, Acts 7, 32, *I am the God of thy Fathers*; And then his Objection returns with double force upon himself, *Would God allow an Angel to take upon him the Style and Character, and to accept the Honour and Worship that belonged to the Father only?*

pag. 54. *OBJ.* 'If, when the Jews worshipped 'the Son who appeared,—they had no No-'tion

'tion of any other God but the One Su-
'preme God, or God the Father; why
'may not Chriſtians then worſhip the ſame
'Perſon when manifeſt in the Fleſh, with
'the ſame Opinion of him that the Jews
'had?

ANSW. Becauſe the *Chriſtians* have a Revelation concerning him, which the *Jews* had not. Chriſt in the Fleſh, does not appear as *repreſenting the Perſon of the Father*, but as a *Perſon ſent forth from the Father* to be our *Mediatour*, *Saviour* and *Redeemer*; and who, diſtinct from the Father, has *a Name given him which is above every Name*; *that at the Name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow*, [all things ſhould be ſubject to His Dominion,]——*and that every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.*

OBJ. 'If he only perſonated the Su- pag. 55.
'preme God, and acted in his Name in the
'*Old* Teſtament; why MIGHT he not
'appear and act under the ſame Character in
'the *New*?

ANSW. He *MIGHT*, no doubt, if God had ſo pleaſed: But that he *DID* not, every page in the New Teſtament is Witneſs. For he no where ſpeaks, or is ſpoken of, in the New Teſtament, as *being God the Father*, but as being the *Son of that God*

God who is the Father of All, and as being *Sent forth by him.*

pag. 55. *OBJ.* 'There is no true ſatisfactory 'Anſwer to be given to This, by any One 'who denies that Chriſt is the ſame God 'with the Father. For 'tis certainly a 'much ſafer, and a more *Rational* Practiſe, 'and better warranted by the Example of 'the Jews, to worſhip the *Father in* and *by* 'Chriſt appearing to us in the Fleſh, than 'to worſhip any other Being——diſtinct 'from God the Father.

ANSW. That there is any thing in it—ſelf not *Rational* in This part of this Learned Author's Scheme, (ſuppoſing the *Father* and *Son* to be nothing but Two *Names* of One and the ſame Individual, or that Chriſt was only a *mere Man* in whom the *Divinity of the Father* manifeſted itſelf;) I cannot indeed affirm. But there is This difficulty in it, that it is *evidently contrary to the Doctrine of the New Teſtament.* For there is expreſsly in the New Teſtament a Worſhip given to the *Son*, which cannot poſſibly belong to *the Father*; a Worſhip given to *one Perſon*, which cannot poſſibly be given to *another*, any more than one perſon can *be* another. For inſtance; When *St John* Rev. 1; 5, 6. ſays, *Unto him that loved us and waſhed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God and his Father*,

Father, to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever; Is it to the *Father in* the Son, that Glory is here aſcribed, for making us Kings and Prieſts to *God and HIS Father?* Again: When the four and twenty Elders *fell down before the Lamb, ſaying,* — *Thou art worthy*;——*for thou waſt Slain, and haſt redeemed us to God by thy Blood*; Is it the *Father in* the Son, that is here glorified for being *Slain*, and *redeeming us TO GOD by his Blood?* And when the innumerable Multitude ſtanding before the Throne, ſaid, *Salvation to our God which ſitteth upon the Throne, AND to the Lamb*; Is the Meaning of it, Glory be to *The Father ſitting upon the Throne*, and to *the Father in* the Lamb? 'Tis very wonderful to me, that ſo Learned an Author ſhould argue, juſt as if the New Teſtament had never been written at all.

Rev. 5; 8, 9.

Rev. 7, 10.

OBJ. 'But the Truth of this whole Matter, according to the *Orthodox* Doctrine, is This. When Chriſt appeared to the Fathers in former Ages, he appeared not in the Perſon either of the *Son*, or of the *Father*, but as *God* abſolutely, as the *Almighty Creator of the World*; as the *God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob*; and the *God of his people Iſrael*;——without any regard to thoſe perſonal Diſtinctions of *Father* and *Son*.

pag. 56.

ANSW.

ANSW. 'Tis somewhat hard to call That the *Orthodox* Doctrine, which (I believe) no one Christian Writer, for a Thousand Years after Christ, ever taught. But (which is more material) 'tis also directly contrary to the New Testament. For *Who* is the *Almighty Creator of the World*, but He whom
Eph. 4, 6. St *Paul* calls *The Father of All?* And *Who* is *the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, the *God of our Fathers*; but He who (as St *Peter* affirms, *Acts* 3, 13,) hath *glorified his Son Jesus*; and whom our Saviour himself thus describes to the Jews, *Joh.* 8, 54, *My Father, of whom ye say that He is your God?* If therefore the *God of Israel* was the *Father of All*, and particularly the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, as both St *Peter* and our *Lord himself* expressly testify; how can this Learned Author affirm, that
Pag. 23. the *God of Israel* was (what he calls) *the Divine Nature absolutely taken, without any regard to the personal Distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; unless he will affirm that the whole *Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, were the *Father of all*, and in particular the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ?*

Pag. 56. *OBJ.* 'From what is Now discovered to 'us, we collect that it was the *Son*, and '*not the Father*, who appeared as God in 'the Antient Times, and was *worshipped* as

'the

'the *One Supreme God*, by the Jewish 'Nation.

ANSW. According to these words, the Jews did not worship *God the Father* at all, but the *Son* only. Yet This seems, not to be this Learned Authors meaning: Only he introduces every where a *Total Confusion of Persons*. The Truth is; the Antient Jews did not worship the *Son* at all, but the *Invisible Father only*, appearing by his *Son* who is stiled the *Angel of his presence*.

OBJ. 'We may Now speak the same *pag.* 57. 'things of Christ, ascribe the same Titles 'to him, and worship him with the same 'worship, as the Jews did of Old; adding 'only those personal Characters and Di-'stinctions which are revealed to us, and 'were not known to them.

ANSW. That is to say: We must not worship Christ, as being our *Mediatour* and *Advocate with the Father*; We must not worship him, as we find him worshipped in the New Testament, for having *loved us and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood*, for having *redeemed us to God by his Blood*, and *made us Kings and Priests unto God and his Father*: But we must worship him, as the Jews worshipped God under the Old Testament; we must worship him as *being* the *God and Father of all*; only we must not *call* him by the *Name* of *Father*,

ther, but by that of *Son*. All This, is very hard to underſtand, and more hard to reconcile with the Doctrine of the New Teſtament.

pag. 58. *OBJ.* In that paſſage, Joh. 10, 33, *Thou, being a Man, makeſt thyſelf God*, 'tis plain the word *God* is taken *abſolutely*, and yet it cannot mean the *Father*, becauſe the Jews knew very well that Chriſt did not pretend to be the *Father*, but the *Son of God*; and therefore when *God*, in Other places, is taken *abſolutely*, it cannot be *confined* to the Perſon of the *Father*.

ANSW. As the Jews knew very well, that Chriſt did not pretend to be *The Father*; ſo neither did They nor his own Diſciples then underſtand him to affirm himſelf to be the *Son of God*, in any ſuch Senſe as Chriſtians now underſtand it: As appears evidently from his Diſciples aſking him even *after* his Reſurrection, *Acts* 1, 6, *Lord, wilt thou at This time reſtore again the* [temporal] *Kingdom to Iſrael?* But, becauſe he declared himſelf to be the *Son of God*, [the True *Meſſiah*,] in the Senſe which he himſelf explains in the following Verſes; therefore the Jews maliciouſly accuſed him of *making himſelf God*, juſt as Men ſay to an arrogant and preſumptuous Perſon, *you make yourſelf King*. See this whole

whole matter largely explained in the foregoing Papers, *pag.* 132, 144, *&c.* The Jews, whenever they mention *God*, always mean the *Father:* Joh. 8, 54, *My Father, of whom ye say that he is your God.* And if in the present passage the word had been used otherwise, (as it plainly is not;) yet it would not at all from hence have followed, that the word *God* in *Other* places signified any other than the *Father*; particularly in those Three Hundred Texts, wherein (as has been before observed) it is of necessity by the Construction itself confined to the *Father only*, as being expressly contradistinguished in those very Texts from the *Son* and *Spirit*.

OBJ. 'The more *likelihood* there was 'of mistaking Christ for the True God, 'the more Reason there is to suppose he—— 'would have ministred no just occasion for 'such a Mistake. But our Saviour, 'tis 'plain,—did nothing to prevent his being 'thought *God.*——When Christ was accused of Blasphemy for pretending to such 'Characters and Powers as belonged to God 'alone, no other Answers are given, but 'what plainly allow the charge, if he were 'not truly God, *Mar.* 2, 9; 14, 64. *Joh.* '10, 33. *pag.* 57, 58, 59.

ANSW. That Christ *is* (and in *what Sense* he is) *Truly God*, I have largely shown in

in the fore-going Papers. But what *LIKELIHOOD* there was, the Jews should mistake Christ for the *True God* in this Learned Author's Sense; I cannot imagine. Our Saviour, far from doing *nothing*, did almost *every thing* in such a manner, as effectually to prevent his being confounded with *God the Father*. For he perpetually declares himself to be *sent forth from the Father*, to *speak and act by his Commission and Authority*; to do nothing *of himself*, but every thing by the *Power of the Father*; and nothing to his *own Honour*, but every thing to the Honour of *his Father*. And when he was accused of *Blasphemy* for pretending to be the *Son of God*, the True *Messiah*; the *Answers* this learned Author refers to as *plainly allowing the charge*, if the *Son* were not the Same with the *Father*; those very Answers (I say) which this Learned Author alleges, do most evidently *disallow* the Charge upon *quite another foot*. The Answers themselves are: *Mar.* 2, 10, *The Son of Man hath Power*, [Power from his Father; *not*, Power by being himself the Father,] *on Earth to forgive Sins*. Mar. 14, 62, *I am the Christ, the Son of the Blessed:* He does not say, he was himself That Person whom the High-Priest stiles *The Blessed One*; but the *Son* of *the Blessed One*. And *Joh.* 10, 34, Our Lord, in answer to the same charge of *Blasphemy* for calling

calling himſelf the *Son of God*, thus replies: *Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid* [concerning Magiſtrates] *Ye are Gods*; *If he called Them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken*; *Say ye of Him whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* See this whole Matter largely explained in the fore-going Papers, *pag.* 132, 144, 149 *&c.*

Obj. 'There is no Inſtance in Scrip- *pag.* 55.
'ture, where the Word *God*, when uſed
'in the ſecond Perſon, is capable of being
'applied to any other Being, but the True
'and Only God.

ANSW. Heb. 1, 8, *Unto the* Son *he ſaith, Thy Throne, O* God, *is for ever and ever*; ——*God, even Thy God has anointed thee* &c. In This Text, the Word, *O God*, is uſed in the ſecond Perſon concerning Chriſt: Yet ſurely this learned Author will not affirm, that 'tis concerning Him who in Scripture is ſtiled (by way of Eminence) *The True and Only God*, that This Text declares that *GOD* even *HIS GOD* has anointed him. In like manner, in *every one* of thoſe Texts of the New Teſtament, wherein Chriſt is ſtiled *God*; there is ſomething in the Conſtruction of the Words, which evidently prevents that Confuſion of

Persons, which This learned Author's Scheme every where tends to introduce.

Pag. 59, 60. *OBJ.* 'In those very places of the *New* 'Testament, which teach us that the God 'who appeared in Times past as the most 'High God, was Christ the Son of God; 'he is stiled *God* absolutely, in the same 'manner as he was in the *Old* Testa-'ment.

ANSW. In *None* of those places of the New Testament which refer to Christ's appearing under the Old, is he stiled *God*; but expressly on the contrary, the *ANGEL of the Lord*, Acts 7, 30, speaking in the *Name of God*, and saying, *I am the God of thy Fathers*, &c. The Passages this learned Author here alleges in Proof of his Assertion, are only These which follow:

1 *Cor.* 10, 5, *With many of them* God *was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the Wilderness.* [The *God* here meant, (*he says,*) is *Christ*; because, *ver.* 4, *Christ* is called the *Spiritual Rock which followed them*; and *ver.* 9, We are admonished *not to tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents.*]

Heb. 6, 13. *When* God *made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself.*

Heb. 11, 3. *The Worlds were framed by the Word of* God.

Heb. 11, 4.

Heb. 11, 4. *Abel offered unto* God;——God *testifying of his Gifts.*

7. *Noah being warned of* God.

" In all these places, *(he says,)* where " the Word *God* is mention'd absolutely, " *Christ* is meant; because whatever is here " said of *God*, 'tis owned belongs to *Christ* " in the Old Testament. "

But indeed in *None* of these places does the Word *God* mean *Christ*, but *the Father*, according to the *Analogy* of the whole New Testament; as I have shown at large in my *Scripture-doctrine*. Neither do any of these things belong to *Christ* in the *Old* Testament, any otherwise than as he was the *Angel* of his Father's Presence, the Visible Person that there represented the Invisible God. And particularly in that Passage, *Heb.* 11, 3, *The Worlds were framed by the Word of GOD*, it is manifestly absurd to affirm (as this learned Writer does) that the Word [*God*] means *Christ*. For then the Apostles Assertion would be This, *The Worlds were framed by the Word of the WORD:* Whereas indeed, in That place, not the Word [*God*,] but the Phrase [*The Word of God*,] signifies *Christ*.

OBJ. ' But that which sets this Matter ' past Dispute, is the plain Declaration of ' our Saviour, *Joh.* 5, 23, *that all Men should* ' *honour the Son, even as they honour the Fa-* pag. 61.

'*ther*; —— without suggesting Any *Di-*
'*stinction* or *Limitation* thereupon.

ANSW. And does he indeed suggest no *Distinction* or *Limitation* thereupon? 'Tis very strange, a Learned and Judicious Writer should assert This; when both in the very Words immediately *fore-going*, and in those immediately *following*, there is an *express Distinction* or *Limitation* added, from the *Reason* and *End* of the Honour paid to the Son. The *Reason* or *Ground* of it, is, that the Father hath *COMMITTED* all Judgment to the Son: And the *End* of it, is, to the *Honour of the FATHER which sent him.* The Words of our Saviour are these: *The Father judgeth no Man, but hath COMMITTED all Judgment to the Son: That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father: He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the FATHER WHICH HAS SENT him.* [The Expression is of the same Nature, as That in *ch.* 14, 1; *Ye believe in* God, *believe also in* Me.] Thus likewise St *Paul*, Phil. 2, 10, *That at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow*, [every thing should become subject to his Dominion,] *and every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the GLORY of GOD THE FATHER.* Besides: The Word [καθὼς, *even as*,] in St *John's* Stile, never signifies an *exact Equality*, but only a *general Similitude.* Thus *Joh.* 17, 11, *That they may*

be

be One, as [καθὼς] *We are.* Ver. 14, *They are not of the World*, even as [καθὼς] *I am not of the World.* Ver. 21, *That They all may be One*, as [καθὼς] *Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee.* Ver. 23, *Thou hast loved Them*, as [καθὼς] *Thou hast loved Me.*

If this Text therefore *sets this Matter* (as this learned Author affirms) *past dispute*, I am sure it is *past dispute* on *which* Side it determines it.

OBJ. 'All such Titles and Appellations 'which belong to God *as Father of Jesus* 'Christ, are excepted out of This Rule, 'and cannot be applied to the *Son*, and 'make part of the *Honour* that we are 'to give him. But then 'tis manifest that 'no *other* are excepted; and consequently 'the meaning of the Rule [*honour the Son* 'even as ye honour the Father] must be, 'that whatever Honour you gave to *God* 'absolutely, before This Distinction of *Father and Son* was made known to you, you 'shall now give to Him who is revealed to 'be the *Son of God.* p. 62.

ANSW. This is expressly giving up the whole Question. For the Honour given to *God absolutely*, before the Revelation of the Gospel; was not given to *a God which was both Father and Son*, but to Him who always was and is *absolutely The One God and*

FATHER of all, Eph. 4, 6; even the *God of Israel*, That *God of our Fathers, who* (as St *Peter* declares, *Acts* 3, 13,) *glorified HIS Son Jesus*; and consequently was no other, than He who now is the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Wherefore if that Honour be excepted, and appropriated to *God the Father*, which belongs to the Person of *the Father*, as *Father*; as Now *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and both Now and Always *Father of All*, [πατηρ παντων, Eph. 4, 6:) I have nothing further to contend for.

Pag. 63. *OBJ.* If the Attributes of the Son 'are 'not Equal to those of the Supreme God 'the Father; what Rules or Measures can 'be prescribed for our Worship of him?
Pag. 65. '—— We cannot tell what Worship and 'Honour is due to the *Son*, more than we 'are now allowed to pay to *Angels*; only 'the giving some higher *Titles* to him,—and '*doing all things in the Name of the Lord* '*Jesus*, for which we have an express Com-'mand in Scripture.

ANSW. What Need have we of any other *Rules* and *Measures* in this Matter, than those prescribed to us in *Scripture? Angels* have no *Kingdom*, no *Dominion* given them: But to the *Son* is given *All Power both* in *Heaven and Earth*, and he is *Head over all things to the Church*, and has

has *a Name* [an Authority] *above every Name, that at the Name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow, and that every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* Can any thing be more *clearly* and *diſtinctly* expreſſed than This?

OBJ. 'There is no ground at all, either in Nature or Scripture, for any direct Application to Chriſt, upon any other Suppoſition but that of his being God; And if we worſhip him as God, we muſt worſhip him as the One only True God; That is, we muſt *honour the Son, as we honour the Father.* And no other difference can be aſſigned in the Worſhip we pay to the *Son* and to the *Father*, than the uſing ſuch *Titles* in our Addreſſes to them, as plainly reſult from thoſe different *Relations.* pag. 66. pag. 65.

ANSW. Worſhipping Chriſt as being the *One only True God*, is not *honouring the Son* [alſo,] *as* [well as] *we honour the Father*; but 'tis *honouring the Son, as being* [himſelf] *the Father.* The Difference between the Worſhip paid to the *Son* in Scripture, and That paid to the *Father*; is not merely *nominal* or *titular*, ſuch as ariſes from the different imaginary *Relations* which One and the Same Being has to *it ſelf:* But 'tis ſuch a Difference of Worſhip, as ariſes from the *real* Difference of their

Offices and Relation towards *Us*. Blessing and Honour is given unto *Him that sitteth upon the Throne*, [viz. to the *Father*,] upon account of his being ὡς θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, *the Lord God Supreme Ruler over all*: But unto *the Lamb*, standing in the midst of, [*or* before the midst of] the Throne, Glory is given upon account of his having *loved us and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood*, having *redeemed us to God by his Blood*, and *made us unto our God Kings and Priests*. The Glory given to the *Son*, is never founded upon such a *Confusion of Persons*, as this Learned Author every where supposes; but upon his being our *Mediatour* and *Advocate with the Father*, and having *a Name given him which is above every Name*. And the reason our Saviour himself expressly gives, why he is to be *honoured, as the Father is honoured*; is, because the *Father hath COMMITTED all judgment unto him*, Joh. 5; 22, 23.

Pag. 66. *OBJ.* 'I do not see which way we can 'warrant our saying, *Christ have mercy upon 'us*; without believing Christ to be The 'True God, the same God with the Fa'ther.

ANSW. It does indeed imply our believing Christ to be *Truly God*: But that it does not imply such a Confusion of Persons, as this Learned Author supposes; appears from

from the parallel Expreſſion, *O Son of David, have mercy upon us.*

OBJ. 'The moſt Primitive Writers—call 'Chriſt *God*, apply the *Divine Attributes* to 'him, *and worſhip* him as *God*, without 'Any *Guard* or *Limitation.* pag. 67, 68.

ANSW. The Primitive Writers he here refers to, are *Clemens*, *Polycarp*, *Ignatius*, *Barnabas* and *Hermas*. Of which *Five* Writers, *Four* very ſeldom, if at all, ſtile Chriſt *God*. *Ignatius* only, does it *frequently*. But both He, and all the reſt of them, far from ſpeaking without *Any Guard* or *Limitation*, do conſtantly and with the utmoſt Care confine to the Perſon of *the Father* thoſe Titles of *Supremacy*, τὸν δεσπότην, τὸν δεσπότην τῶν ὅλων, τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν, τὸν κύριον θεὸν, παντοκρατορα θεὸν, τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὅλων, [The *Supreme Lord*, the *Supreme Lord of all*, the *God over all*, the *Lord God*, *God Almighty* or *Supreme Ruler over all*, the *God of the Univerſe*,] and the like. And indeed, the plain Truth of this whole matter appears ſufficiently from the Very paſſages This Learned Author has cited. For, of above *Forty* Paſſages which he has alleged out of theſe Writers, *not One* expreſſes the Notion which he cites them for; and *ſeveral* of them, expreſs directly the contrary. As *Clemens*; when he ſtiles *Chriſt*, the *HIGH PRIEST*

PRIEST of all our Offerings. And *Polycarp*, when he thus prays; *Now THE GOD and FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ; and He himself who is our everlasting HIGH PRIEST, the Son of God, even Jesus Christ, build you up, &c.* And *Ignatius*, when he says; *There is but One GOD, who made Heaven and Earth and the Sea and all that are in Them; and One Jesus Christ, HIS only-begotten Son.* And the Author of *Polycarp*'s Martyrdom, when he saith,—*glorifies GOD, even the FATHER; and blesses our LORD, the Governour both of our Souls and Bodies, and the Shepherd of the Catholick Church which is over all the Earth.* And *Hermas*, when he says; *The LORD has sworn by HIS Son, that whosoever denieth his Son and Him, &c.* It is not easy to express my Notion more clearly, than these *most Primitive* Writers have done it in these Very Passages, which This Learned Author has cited to prove the contrary. In what manner the Orthodox Writers in the following Age stiled Christ *God*, (besides the passages which I have cited from *Justin Martyr* in my *Scripture-doctrine, Part II, § 36*; and from *Irenæus*, in the foregoing Papers, *pag.* 11;) appears from the following Passages of *Tertullian* and *Novatian*. *I will follow the Apostle*, (says *Tertullian*;) *so that if the* Father

Apostolum sequar, ut si pariter nominandi fuerint *Pater & Filius*, DEUM Patrem appellem, & Jesum Christum

ther *and* Son *are to be named Together, I will style the Father GOD, and Jesus Christ I will call LORD : But Christ, when he is mentioned alone, I may also style* God : *For so I may call a Sun-beam, when it is mentioned alone, the* Sun ; *But when I am speaking of* the Sun *whose Ray it is, then I cannot so well style the Ray* the Sun. The Distinction is very like that which *Origen* makes between θεὸς and ὁ θεὸς ; See above, *pag.* 67. *Novatian* in like manner : *The same Rule of Truth* (saith he) *teaches us, next after the Father, to believe also in the Son of God, even Jesus Christ,* OUR Lord and God, *but* GOD's Son, *even the Son of That GOD, who is the* One *and* Only *God.* And again : *So that God the Father* (says he) *is justly stiled* The God over all ; *and the Original even of the Son himself, whom he begat Lord of All : And at the same time the Son is* The God of all other things, *because God the Father made all things subject to Him whom he begat.* It is not possible for any thing to be expressed more clearly.

DOMINUM nominem : Solum autem Christum, potero *Deum* dicere. —— Nam & radium Solis seorsum *Solem* vocabo ; Solem autem nominans cujus est radius, non statim & radium Solem appellabo. *Adverſ. Prax.*

Eadem regula veritatis docet nos, credere post Patrem etiam in Filium Dei Christum Jesum *Dominum Deum nostrum*, sed *DEI Filium*, hujus *DEI*, qui & *unus* & *solus* est. *De Trin. cap.* 9.

Ut meritò Deus Pater *omnium Deus* sit, & Principium ipsius quoq; Filii quem Dominum genuit : Filius autem *cæterorum omnium Deus* sit, quoniam omnibus illum Deus Pater præposuit quem genuit. *cap.* 31.

OBJ.

pag. 77, 78. *OBJ.* 'Of those Fathers, who lived after the Disputes concerning the Trinity arose,——*Some* talk of the Son as eternally existing in the Bosom, Bowels, or Heart of the Father; but proceeding forth and manifesting himself as a distinct Person from the Father, just before the Creation of the World.——*Others* speak of Christ as the Son of God, Begotten before all Worlds, much in the same Language that the SCRIPTURES do, without determining any thing farther concerning the *Time* or *Manner* of his Generation.—— *SOME* of them who indeavoured to enter farther into this Mystery than the rest, *SEEM* to assert, that the Son was of the same *Nature*, *Essence*, and *Substance* with the Father.

ANSW. From This Account of *Antiquity*, I trust the Reader will not conceive that any Inference can be drawn, against any thing that I have affirmed.

pag. 79. *OBJ.* 'OTHERS [*of the Fathers*] have given such a Preheminence to the *Father*, by making the Titles of Αὐτόθεος and ὁ ὄντως θεὸς [*God Self-existent*, and *The God of the Universe*] peculiar to him, *&c.*

ANSW. Not *OTHERS*, but *ALL* of the Fathers unanimously, make these Titles *peculiar* to the Person of the *Father*.

OBJ.

OBJ. 'All the Antient Apologiſts, in- pag. 84.
'ſiſt very much upon the *Unity* of God;—
'and plainly declare that they have the
'*ſame God* that the Jews had, *viz.* the
'Maker of the Univerſe, the God of Abra-
'ham, Iſaac and Jacob.——Yet at the ſame pag. 85.
'time they acknowledge Chriſt to be God.

ANSW. The Antients do indeed *conſtantly* inſiſt upon the *Unity* of *God*; and they do *as conſtantly* inſiſt, that *That One God* is *the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. In what Senſe they do at the ſame time acknowledge *Chriſt* to be *God*, has been at large explained in the *fore-going Papers*, and in my *Scripture-doctrine*, from numerous expreſs and clear Teſtimonies of thoſe Antient Writers.

OBJ. 'What *Origen* ſays, (*lib.* 8. *contr.* pag. 85.
'*Celſ. p.* 386, ἕνα θεὸν, τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν
'υἱὸν θεραπεύομεν,) *We worſhip One God,*
'*the Father, and the Son*; may be looked
'upon as a ſhort Summary of the common
'Faith and Practiſe of the firſt Chriſtians,
'with relation to this grand Article.

ANSW. If the Reader pleaſes to look back to *pag.* 55, he will find that This *whole* Paſſage of *Origen*, which I have there tranſcribed, (and of which this Learned Author has here cited only the ſame *ſcrap*, that the Anonymous Author recommended

by

by Mr *Nelson* had before cited; does) most fully and expressly prove the *direct contrary* to what Both these learned Writers allege it as proving.

pag. 85. *OBJ.* 'In *NO* Discourses written [*by the Antients*] for the Use of Believers, 'whether Jewish or Gentile Converts, are 'there Any such Arguments brought to 'justify the Worship of Christ, as that—— 'he was to be worshipped, only because 'God *commanded* it.

ANSW. What Ground there is for This Assertion, may be judged from That passage of *St Paul*, Phil. 2, 9, *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name*; *That at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow*, [all things should be subject to His Dominion,]—— *and that* [accordingly, in acknowledgment of That Dominion,] *every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* And from That Declaration of *Justin Martyr: He*, (says he,) *who being full of true Piety, loves God with all his Heart, and with all his Strength, will honour* [or *worship*] *no Other God*; *though he will indeed also honour* [or *worship*] *That Messenger of God* [viz. Christ, the Angel of his Presence,] *according to the WILL* [or *Command*] *of God.*

Ὁ γὰρ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος ἀγαπῶν τὸν Θεὸν, πλήρης θεοσεβὴς γνώμης ὑπάρχων, οὐδένα ἄλλον πλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ Ἄγγελον ἐκεῖνον ἂν τιμήσῃ Θεῷ ΠΟΤΛΟΜΕΝΟΥ. *Dial. cum Tryphone.*

God. And from the following passage of *Irenæus: That every knee* (saith he) *might bow to Christ Jesus our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, according to the GOOD PLEASURE of the Invisible Father.* And from the following words of *Origen: We demand* (saith he) *of* Celsus, *concerning those whom they worship as Gods, what Proof they have that the Supreme God hath appointed them to be worshipped: And if, in reply, they put to Us the same Question concerning Jesus; we can show that God hath appointed Him to be worshipped:* "*That all Men should honour the Son, even* "*as they honour the Father*". Thus likewise *Cyprian: God the Father* (saith he) *Commanded that his Son should be worshipped: And the Apostle Paul, mindful of the Divine Command, says accordingly; God has exalted him, and hath given him a Name which is above every Name; that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth.* If it shall be alleged

Ἵνα χεισῶ Ἰησῦ πρὸ κυείῳ ἡμῶν καὶ θεῷ καὶ σωτῆει καὶ βασιλεῖ, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τῦ πατεὸς τῦ ἀοεάτε, πᾶν γόνυ κάμπῃ. *Lib.* 1. *cap.* 10.

Καὶ πεὶ τῶν ἄλλων [πεμωμένων ὡς θεῶν] ἐεῦμεν, ἀπαιτῦντες ἀποδειξιν πεὶ τῦ δεδόθαι αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῦ τὸ πμᾶθαι. Ἐὰν δ' ἡμῖν ἀνθυποφέεη τὸ παεαπλησίον πεὶ τῦ Ἰησῦ, ἀποδείξομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεῦ δέδοται αὐτῷ τὸ πμᾶθαι, ἵνα πάντες πμῶσι τὸν υἱὸν, καθὼς πμῶσι τὸν πατέεα. *Contr. Cels. lib.* 8.

Pater Deus *præcepit* filium suum adorari; & Apostolus Paulus, divini præcepti memor, ponit & dicit; *Deus exaltavit illum, & donavit illi nomen, quod est super omne nomen, ut in nomine Jesu omne genu flectatur, cælestium, terrestrium, & infernorum.* De bono Patientiæ.

alleged

alleged that these things are spoken of *Christ*, only as *Man:* Then it will follow, that there is a Worship due to the *Man Christ Jesus*, distinct and different from the Worship of *God*; or that there are Two distinct sorts of Worship due to Christ, the one due to him in his *humane Nature*, the other in his *Divine*; or that the *Manhood only* of Christ, and *not His whole Person*, is our *Mediatour and Advocate* with the Father, and to be worshipped accordingly with this *Mediatorial Worship*. All which things are contrary to this Learned Authors Hypothesis.

pag. 86. *OBJ.* 'How could the *Jews*, who were 'so afraid of Idolatry; and the *Heathen*, 'who were so addicted to it, and so ac-'customed to the Notion of *many Deities* 'under the *One Supreme*; both join in the 'Worship of *Christ*, without the least Ap-'prehension of a Plurality of Gods; unless 'they had been throughly convinced, that '*Christ* was the same God with the *Fa-'ther?*

ANSW. As to the *Jews*; this Learned Author answers himself in the very same page: *The Jews* (says he) *in our Saviour's time had very strict Notions of the Unity of God; and therefore the Apostles, in their Discourses to Them, never mention any thing of this first Principle of Religion, but, taking*

king it for granted, insist wholly upon Christs being the Messiah or SON of GOD. What follows from hence, but that the Jews were taught to receive Christ as the *Son* of That *One God*, whom they already believed in? and consequently, that the *God of the Jews*, was no other than the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ?* and that therefore there was no alteration made in their Notion of *One God*; but only they were further taught, that besides the *One God*, there was also *One Mediatour*, whom they were to honour and worship as such? As to the *Gentiles*; what *They* were taught to believe concerning Christ, *St Paul* tells us, 1 *Cor.* 8, 5, *There are that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many;) But to Us there is but One GOD, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and One LORD, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him.*

OBJ. 'Those of them [*of the Followers* pag. 88.] '*of* Socinus,] who allow of the Worship 'of *Christ*, profess to worship the *Father*, 'and Him only, as manifesting himself *in* 'and *by Christ*.

ANSW. Wherein This Learned Authors *own* Scheme, differs from that of these Followers of *Socinus*, whom he here mentions; is very hard to show.

pag. 88. *OBJ.* 'The chief Article of the *Sabel-*
'*lian* Heresy, was, that the *Father* and *Son*
'were only different *Denominations* of the
'same God, and that there was no other
'personal Distinction between them.

ANSW. The only Difference then, between the *Sabellian* Heresy, and his *own* Scheme, is this; that What *They* called different *Denominations of the same God*, *He* calls different *personal Characters* of *the Same Supreme Being*: Which is indeed no Difference at all.

pag. 89, 90. *OBJ.* 'The *greatest part of Christians*
'in *Tertullian*'s time, [the *simplices quique,*
'*quæ major semper credentium pars est,*] had
'much the same Notion of the Trinity
pag. 88. 'that *Praxeas* had. And *Praxeas* himself
'was in great Reputation with some of the
'chief Bishops of That Age. From whence
'it may fairly be collected, that it was the
'common Language of the Orthodox, which
'gave rise to this False [*Sabellian*] Opi-
'nion.

ANSW. The Sabellian Opinion of *Praxeas*, is thus expressed by *Tertullian*:
Adv. Prax. [Post tempus Pater natus, & Pater passus; ipse Deus, Dominus Omnipotens, Jesus Christus prædicatur:] *The Father was Born in time, the Father suffered; and Jesus Christ is preached, as being The Lord God Almighty*

Almighty Himſelf. Wherein this Opinion *really* differs from that of our Learned Author himſelf, is (as I now obſerved) very hard to ſhow. But that it was not the Opinion of the *greateſt part of Chriſtians*, thoſe *plain and unlearned Chriſtians* in *Tertullian*'s time, who perpetually cried out, [Monarchiam tenemus,] *We contend for the Government of One God over the Univerſe*; appears from hence, that *Tertullian* calls *Praxeas*'s Opinion [novellitatem Praxeæ heſterni] *a Novelty of Yeſterday*; whereas the Opinion of the then greater part of Chriſtians, was what he ſuppoſes to prevail *always* among the unlearned, from the Simplicity of the *Creed itſelf* which taught them to believe in *One God*; [Simplices quique, ——quæ major ſemper credentium pars eſt; quoniam & ipſa *REGULA Fidei* a pluribus Diis ſeculi, ad *Unicum & verum Deum* transfert.] What this Opinion was, appears clearly enough in the Writers before and about that Time; viz. *Juſtin*, *Irenæus*, *Origen* and *Novatian*.

OBJ. 'It may be fairly replied, that 'the word *God*, in all the paſſages cited 'in the Three firſt Sections of Dr *Clarke*'s 'Scripture-Doctrine, ought not to be con- 'fined to the Perſon of the *Father* only; 'but is applicable to the *Divine Nature* 'conſidered abſolutely, without any di- pag. 94 & 95.

'ſtinction of Perſons; EXCEPTING on-
'ly where the Conſtruction itſelf neceſſa-
'rily implies ſuch Diſtinction: Or elſe,
'if we take in the Notion of different Per-
'ſons; then where-ever mention is made
'of *God* abſolutely, or the *One God*, the
'*True God*, or the like; the meaning muſt
'be, that the *Father*, *conſidered with his*
'*Son and Spirit*, is God, the One God, the
'True God &c. This ſeems to be the plain
'natural Conſtruction of all the paſſages
'cited in theſe Three Sections.

ANSW. In the *ſecond* Section alone of my Scripture-Doctrine, (beſides the Texts cited in the *firſt* and *third* Sections,) there are more than three Hundred Texts, wherein the word *God*, by the Conſtruction of the Text itſelf, is of neceſſity confined to the Perſon of the *Father* ſingly, becauſe expreſsly contradiſtinguiſhed in the very ſame Sentence, either from the *Son* or the *Spirit* or *Both*. As when St *Paul* ſays, 1 *Cor.* 6; 4, 5, 6, The ſame *Spirit*, the ſame *Lord*, the ſame *GOD*: And *Epheſ.* 4; 4, 5, 6, One *Spirit*, One *Lord*, One *GOD and Father of All*: And the like. Now to allege, as this Learned Author does, *that the word* God, *in all the paſſages* I *cited in thoſe Three Sections, ought not to be confined to the Perſon of the* Father *ſingly, EXCEPTING only where the Conſtruction itſelf neceſſarily ſo requires*; What is this, but al-

leging,

leging, that ALL the Texts I cited, are miſapplied, EXCEPTING only ſomewhat more than THREE HUNDRED, which the Conſtruction itſelf neceſſarily ſhows to be righty applied? The Reader will obſerve This to be a conſiderable *Exception*; even though ſome Few of the other Texts *had been* really miſapplied by me; as this Learned Author has *not* ſhown that Any of them *are*. Again: To affirm (as this Learned Author does,) that according to the *plain natural Conſtruction* of thoſe numerous paſſages I cited, wherein the *Father* is ſtiled *God* and *the One God*, in expreſs Contradiſtinction to the *Son* and *Spirit* in the very words of the Text itſelf; to affirm (I ſay) that *the meaning* of theſe Texts *muſt be*, that the word *God* abſolutely, or the *One God*, ſignifies *the Father conſidered with his Son and Spirit*; What is This, but affirming the *Father alone*, to be *Father and Son and Spirit?* Beſides: When he ſays that the word *God* is applicable to the *Divine Nature conſidered abſolutely, without any diſtinction of Perſons*; is not This begging the Queſtion directly? For Where does it appear that the *Divine Nature conſidered abſolutely*, ever ſignifies any thing elſe, but the *Nature of God*, of the *One God and Father of all*, conſidered only abſtract perhaps from the Relation of *Paternity?* Though even *That* indeed, can hardly be

abstracted. For it seems to be an inseparable Character of the *Divine Nature*, that is, of *Him* whose That Nature is; (For *Nature itself*, is nothing but an *Abstract Name*;) to be *Father of all*, πατὴρ πάντων, *Eph.* 4, 6.

Pag. 97. *OBJ.* 'If Christ is *Supreme over All*, 'though not *absolutely Supreme over All*;— 'wherein is Christ distinguished from the 'Father, but only as he is a *Son*? For 'take away the Distinctions of *Father* and '*Son*, and Christ is——*Supreme Lord of* '*the Universe*.

ANSW. Christ is never stiled either *Supreme over all*, or *absolutely Supreme over all*. He is indeed *over All*, and *Lord of all*; but still always *excepting* (as St *Paul* directs us) *Him that did put all things under him*. *Supremacy* therefore, is an Attribute of the *Father*, absolutely *incommunicable*. And to say, that, *taking away the Distinctions of Father and Son, Christ is Supreme Lord of the Universe*; is only saying in other words, that the Distinction between the Father and the Son is inconsiderable and to be neglected, because the *Son* also is *Supreme*, excepting only that he is *not Supreme*.

Pag. 98. *OBJ.* 'If the word *God*, when mentioned absolutely, is applied to *the Son* in 'Scripture,

'Scripture, then not only the paſſages col-
'lected in the *ſecond* Section of Dr *Clarke's*
'*Scripture-Doctrine*, are very improperly
'ranged under their Title, but the *firſt*
'and *third* Sections are altogether uſeleſs.
'For if Chriſt be *God abſolutely*, he is alſo
'the *Only God*, the *Living God*, *&c.*

ANSW. It ſhould here have been added, by the very ſame reaſon; that *the Son is alſo the Father of All*, the *One God and Father of All:* And then the Force of the Argument, would have been evident to every Reader. The Truth of the matter, is plainly This: The word, *God*, when uſed *abſolutely*, always ſignifies *the Father:* I cited, in that *ſecond* Section which this Learned Author here refers to, more than three Hundred Texts, wherein the Conſtruction of the words neceſſarily and confeſſedly determines it ſo to ſignify. Were there now any Texts, wherein the ſame word, uſed in the ſame Manner and in the ſame Senſe, clearly ſignified *the Son*; it would follow of neceſſity, that the *Father* was the *Son*, and the *Son* the *Father*. But the Caſe is not ſo. There are, in all, thirteen Texts, wherein the word *God* has by ſome been thought to ſignify the *Son*; [*Matt.* 1, 23; *Luke* 1, 16; *Joh.* 1, 1; 10, 33; 20, 28; *Acts* 20, 28; *Rom.* 9, 5; 1 *Tim.* 3, 16; *Tit.* 2, 13; *Heb.* 1, 8; 2 *Pet.* 1, 1; 1 *Joh.* 3, 16; 5, 20.] In

Five of these Texts, [viz. *Luke* 1 16; *Tit.* 2, 13; 2 *Pet.* 1, 1; 1 *Joh.* 3, 16; & 1 *Joh.* 5, 20;] it certainly signifies, not the *Son*, but the *Father*. *Six* of them, [viz. *Matt.* 1, 23; *Joh.* 10, 33; 20, 28; *Acts* 20, 28; *Rom.* 9, 5; & 1 *Tim.* 3, 16;] are justly contested as ambiguous: That is to say; Either it is ambiguous whether the Word [θεὸς, *God*,] was originally in the Text at all; as *Acts* 20, 28; *Rom.* 9, 5; & 1 *Tim.* 3, 16; Or else it is ambiguous whether it refers to the Father or the Son; and, if it refers to the Son, yet it is then clearly understood in a Sense different from what this Learned Author supposes; as in the Three last-cited Texts, and in *Matt.* 1, 23; *Joh.* 10, 33; & *Joh.* 20, 28. The *Two* remaining Texts, [*Joh.* 1, 1; & *Heb.* 1, 8;] wherein the *Son* is clearly stiled *God*, do each of them at the same time no less clearly distinguish him from ὁ θεὸς *the God whom he was with*, whom *he came from*, and who is stiled *His God anointing him*, &c. Which Distinction, is also (as I now observed) no less evident in every one of the *contested* Texts, supposing the Reading of them to be true, and the *Son* to be there spoken of: As may be seen in my Notes upon each of the Texts themselves, both in the fore-going Papers, and in my *Scripture-Doctrine*. Add to this the *numerous* places, wherein Christ declares that the *Son* can do *nothing of himself*, but *lives*

and

and *is ſent* and *acts* in all things by the *Will* and Authority of the *Father*. See *Scripture-Doctrine*, Part II, § 34 & 36.

OBJ. 'Had not Chriſt been God in the 'ſame Senſe, in which the word was un- 'derſtood before his Appearance in the 'Fleſh; [*That is to ſay, had not the Son been,* πατὴρ πάντων, *The Father of All*;] 'it is very reaſonable to believe, that he 'would have been ſtiled God, (if he had 'taken upon him That Name at all,) with 'ſome lower Titles, Epithets, or Attri- 'butes, than the Father was: As,—— '*Divine Perſon*, and the like: Or, at leaſt, 'with ſome *Exceptions*; as *God*, but *not* '*the moſt High*, &c. *pag.* 98.

ANSW. This is the *Very* manner, in which He is ſtiled *God* in the *New* Teſtament. For thus *Origen*, (in the paſſage I cited above, *pag.* 65, 66, 67;) ſhows that Θεὸς in the firſt Verſe of St *John*'s Goſpel, as there diſtinguiſhed from ὁ Θεὸς, ſignifies *a Divine Perſon*. And *Euſebius*, in his *Theolog. Eccleſiaſt. lib.* 2, *cap.* 17, does, in a profeſſed Diſcourſe upon That very Text, largely explain the ſame Diſtinction. Now 'tis well known that *Origen* and *Euſebius* underſtood Greek better, and had more Learning, than all the other Fathers that ever wrote. Nay, and even *Clemens Alexandrinus* himſelf, who (as I obſerved above,

pag.

pag. 67,) spake in his *Pædagogus* more confusedly; in his *Strom.* 3, thus expresses the same Notion with great Distinctness; [ὁ γὰρ Θεὸν ἁπλῶς προσεῖπεν ὁ τῇ τῆ ἄρθρῳ προστάξει τὸν παντοκράτορα δηλώσας,] *The Scripture* (saith he, speaking of a particular Text,) *does not here use barely the word* Θεὸς, *but, by adding the Article* ὁ Θεὸς, *signifies that it means Him who is Supreme over All.*

Then as to the *Exceptions* which he thinks ought to have been made; *St Paul* answers, that the *Exception* this Learned Author wants, *is* and *ought* always to be made. *'Tis manifest*, says he, 1 *Cor.* 15, 27, (that is, 'tis Manifest to common Sense, without needing to be often repeated,) *that He is* [always] *excepted, which did put all things under him.* And *our Saviour* himself, in all his Discourses in the Gospel, constantly speaks of Himself with Lower Titles and Epithets, than of the Father; as being *sent forth* from Him, speaking and acting by *His* Authority, and doing all things to *His* Honour and Glory.

pag. 99. *OBJ.* 'So, when it is said that *the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him*, we 'should probably have been told that it was 'not *the eternal Godhead* here meant, as *Rom.* 1, 20; but *Divine Power*, as the 'word Θεότης is rendred by *Dr Clarke.*

ANSW.

ANSW. In That very Paſſage it ſelf, *Rom.* 1, 20, θεότης ſignifies nothing elſe but *Divine Power* or *Dominion*; not the *Subſtance* of *God*, which this learned Author ſeems erroneouſly to think the Word *Godhead* ſignifies. The Words are, ἥτε ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, *his eternal Power and Divinity* or *Divine Dominion*. Θειότης, is as much an Attribute, as δύναμις; not the *Subſtance*, but the *Divine Dominion* of God. So likewiſe therefore in That other Paſſage, *Col.* 2, 9, *In him dwelleth all the Fulneſs of the Godhead*; the meaning is, *the Fulneſs of Divine Power, Dominion and Authority:* In like manner, as *Col.* 1, 19, *It pleaſed the Father, that in Him ſhould all Fulneſs dwell*; and *Joh.* 14, 10, *The Father that dwelleth in Me, he doth the Works*; That is, not the *Perſon*, but the *Divine Power*, [ἡ θεότης] of the *Father*, dwelleth in Chriſt. Thus the Word [θεότης *Divinity*,] Always ſignifies; in the ſame manner as ἀνθρωπότης, and all other Words of the like Formation. And 'tis as great an Abuſe of Language, to ſuppoſe [θεότης] the *Deity* or *Divinity*, that is, the *Dominion* of *God*, to ſignifie the *Subſtance* of *God*; as it would be to underſtand [ἀνθρωπότης] *Manhood*, to ſignifie the *Subſtance* of *Man*. Where *Deity* is put (by a mere Idiom of the *Engliſh* Language) for *God* himſelf,

ſelf, as *Acts* 17, 29; 'tis in the *Greek*, not ἡ θεότης, but τὸ θεῖον. Further: 'Tis worth obſerving upon this occaſion, that not only θεότης, the *Divinity*, or *Supreme Dominion*, of *God*; but even This other Word itſelf, θεὸς *God*, has in Scripture, and in all Books of *Morality* and *Religion*, a *relative Signification*; and not, as in *metaphyſical* Books, an *Abſolute* One. As is evident from the *relative* Terms, which in *moral* Writings may always be joined with it. For inſtance: In the ſame manner as we ſay, *my* Father, *my* King, and the like; ſo it is proper alſo to ſay, *my* God, the God *of Iſrael*, the God *of the Univerſe*, and the like: Which Words are expreſſive of *Dominion* and *Government*. But, in the *metaphyſical* way, it cannot be ſaid, *My* Infinite Subſtance, The Infinite Subſtance *of Iſrael*, or the like. Which plainly ſhows in what Senſe the Word *Godhead*, always ought to be underſtood in *Theological* Matters.

pag. 101, 102. *OBJ.* 'Where we aſcribe the ſame 'things to both [*Father and Son*,] we are 'to ſuppoſe them to be ORIGINALLY in 'the Father, and by DERIVATION or 'Communication in the Son. But none of 'theſe Diſtinctions alter any thing in our 'Notions, either of God, or Divine Wor'ſhip. For STILL we ſay, the Son is God 'in

'in the SAME Senſe, that the Father is 'God; and as God, he is to be worſhipped 'with the SAME Worſhip; notwithſtanding any ſuch Perſonal PREROGATIVES 'as are here aſcribed to the Father.—— 'Having been careful to maintain all theſe 'Perſonal Characters and DISTINCTIONS, we think our ſelves not only at 'Liberty, but obliged, in all OTHER reſpects to honour the Son even as we honour the Father.

ANSW. To *Me*, all this appears to be an expreſs Contradiction in the very Terms. I leave it to the Reader to conſider.

OBJ. 'Since Chriſt is to be worſhipped 'in ALL the SAME Kinds and Inſtances 'of proper and direct Worſhip, in which 'the Father is worſhipped; there is no 'Uſe to be made of any of thoſe metaphyſical Diſtinctions before-mentioned, whatever Truth there may be in them. For, 'if we may offer the SAME Prayers and 'Thankſgivings immediately to the Son, 'as we do to the Father;— it is the ſame 'thing whether the Perſon we apply to, be '*unoriginated* or *derived*, be *abſolutely Supreme*, or not. *pag.* 102 & 103.

ANSW. This amounts to ſuch a total Confuſion of Perſons, as (I believe) never was heard of before in the Chriſtian Church. Is there then *no difference* between

tween the *Mediatour* and the Person *mediated to?* Have we an *Advocate with the Father* and *with the Son too?* Is it in vain that the Apostle directs us to *come unto God by Christ*, as by *our great High-Priest*, Heb. 7, 25; 4, 14? Is it in vain that St *Paul* exhorts us to *give thanks to God, even the Father, by Christ*, Col. 3, 17? When we return Thanks to God for *so loving the World, that he gave his only-begotten Son*; would it be as proper to return Thanks to the *SON for sending his only-begotten Son?* When St *Paul blesses the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, for having *predestinated us by Jesus Christ to himself, and made us Accepted in the beloved; and praiseth—— the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory,*——for the *working of his mighty Power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right Hand in heavenly places*, Eph. 1; 3, *&c.* might ALL the SAME Praises and Thanksgivings have with equal Propriety been offered to *Christ himself?* When in our Devotions we say, *Thou, O Christ, art most High in the Glory of God the Father*; would it have been as proper and as true, to say, *Thou, O Father, art most High in the Glory of the Son?* The Third Synod of *Carthage* decreed, on purpose to prevent all Confusion in Divine Worship, and agreeably to the constant Practise of the whole Primi-

Primitive Church; [ut cùm ad Altare assistitur, *Semper* ad Patrem dirigatur oratio,] *that when the Priest stands at the Altar, he should* Always *direct his Prayer to the Father:* And can this Learned Author imagine, that the *Memorial* of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, may as properly be offered to the *Son*, who was *himself* That Sacrifice; as to the *Father*, to whom, and to whom only, that *Sacrifice* was once offered as an Oblation and Propitiation for the Sins of the World? I confess, I can no way see, how this Confusion of Persons can possibly be reconciled with the Scripture-Notion of Christ's being our *Great High-Priest*, our *Mediatour and Advocate with* (not what This Learned Author calls the *Divine Nature*, but, as St *John* expresses it,) *the FATHER*; 1 Joh. 2, 1.

OBJ. 'Whether our Prayers and 'Praises are offered primarily to the Father, or to the Son; and whether the 'Honour we pay the Son, be understood 'as finally and ultimately tending TO 'THE Honour and GLORY OF THE 'FATHER, or not: These are Considera-'tions which never enter into the Mind of 'the Worshipper. *pag.* 103.

ANSW. St *Paul* directly affirms the contrary; *Phil.* 2, 11, *that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, TO THE GLO-*

GLORY OF GOD, THE FATHER. Eph. 3, 21, *Unto Him* [viz. *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in Heaven and Earth is named*, ver. 14,] *be Glory in the Church by Jesus Christ, throughout all Ages, world without end.* Heb. 13, 15, *By Him let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually.* And St *Peter*, 1 Pet. 4, 2, *That God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ.* And our *Saviour* himself, *Joh.* 14, 13, *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my Name, That will I do*; [*whatsoever ye shall ask of the FATHER in my Name, he may give it you*, ch. 15, 16;] *that the FATHER may be GLORIFIED in the Son.* It ought also to weigh something with this Learned Author, that Bp. *Bull*, (speaking expressly of *Christ*, not as *Man*, but as *God*,) says that *All the Honour paid unto the Son, redounds to God the FATHER who begat him*; and commends *Origen* for alleging This very thing as an Argument, to prove that the Christians did not derogate from the *Monarchy* of the *Father*: and testifies that the Notion of the Antient Christians was, that *The GLORY OF THE FATHER was manifested by the Son*; *and that ALL the Honour of the*

Quod omnis Filii honos, in Deum PATREM, qui ipsum genuit, redundet. *Sect.* 4, *cap.* 1, §. 5.

Intelligentes scilicet, per Filium *Patris gloriam* manifestari; omnemq; Filii Gloriam AD PATREM, ut fontem Divinitatis, REDUNDARE. *Sect.* 2, *cap.* 3, § 6.

the Son, Redounds TO THE FATHER, as the Fountain of Divinity.

OBJ. 'The meaning of the Text, (*Joh.* pag. 105.
'10, 30, *I and my Father are One,*) may
'be (unleſs it implies a Contradiction to
'interpret it ſo,) that the Father and Son
'are——One Being——

ANSW. That *Two Perſons* ſhould be *One Being*, is (I think) a manifeſt Contradiction; and if it were not, yet it would not at all *from thence* follow, that it was the True Meaning of the Text. See this Text at large explained above, *pag.* 144, *&c.*

OBJ. Theſe words, [*I and my Father* pag. 106.
are One,] 'are ſpoken by the Son, who, if
'he had been a different Being from the
'Father, and conſequently inferiour to
'him, would not have expreſſed himſelf
'in ſuch a manner, as implied ANY E-
'quality.

ANSW. *What Equality* is implied in theſe words, has at large been ſhown above, *pag.* 144, *&c.*

OBJ. 'Why may we not ſay, that Fa- pag. 106.
'ther and Son are *One and the ſame Being*,
'as well as *One and the ſame Thing?*

ANSW. Becauſe many things may well and uſually be ſpoken *figuratively*, which

cannot be affirmed or understood *literally*.
1 *Cor.* 3, 8. St *Paul* says of *Himself* and *Apollos*, that they were *one and the same thing*; But might he therefore as well and properly have said, they were *One and the same Being*? And when our Saviour prayed, that
Joh. 17, 21. *He* and *His Disciples* might be *One*; could he as properly have said, *One Being?* I am not aware, that the word *One*, in this manner of speaking, ever signifies, in Any Author whatsoever, literally *One Being*.

pag. 107. *OBJ.* 'According to This Scheme, *God* 'is a word of *Office* only, as *Master* and '*King* is; and signifies something distinct 'from the *Divine Nature*.

ANSW. That the word *God* in Scripture, is indeed always a relative word of *Office*, signifying personal *Dominion*, *Dignity*, or *Government*; is evident from hence; that in like manner as we say, *My* Master, *My* Father, *My* King, and the like; so the Scripture teaches us to say also, *MY* God, The God *of Israel*, and the like: Whereas on the other side we cannot say, *My* Divine Nature, the Divine Nature *of Israel*, or the like. Which evidently shows, that the word *God* in Scripture is always used to express a *Person*, and not That which this Learned Author stiles the *Divine Nature*.

OBJ.

Obj. In this paſſage [*I and my Father are One,*] 'why may not [ἕν] ſignify 'the ſame as [εἷς,]' viz. *One and the ſame 'God*, or, (in Dr Clarke's Senſe of the 'word Perſon,) *one and the ſame Perſon*, 'that is, *one and the ſame Being?*—If [τὸ 'ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν, *That which is conceived 'in her*, Matt. 1, 20,] ſignifies the ſame 'as [ὁ γεννηθεὶς, *He which is conceived*;] 'and [τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον, *That holy Thing 'which ſhall be born*, Luke 1, 35,] ſignifies 'the ſame as [ὁ ἅγιος, *That Holy Perſon*;] 'and [δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, *Two 'Things in Subſiſtence*,] is uſed by *Origen* 'to ſignify [*two real diſtinct* Perſons:] 'Why then may not the word [ἕν] in St 'John, mean One and the ſame *Being*, as 'well as One and the ſame *Thing?* pag. 109.

ANSW. The Learned Biſhop *Bull* tells us, [*Defenſ. Sect.* 2, *cap.* 9, § 11,] that [res ſingularis per ſe ſubſiſtens, in rebus intellectu præditis idem eſt quod perſona,] *a particular Being, ſubſiſting by itſelf, is, in things indued with Underſtanding, the ſame as Perſon.* The reaſon therefore, (beſides that the whole Thread of his Diſcourſe leads to another Interpretation,) why our Saviour could not here mean to affirm, that *He and his Father were One Being*, is becauſe he would thereby have affirmed that they were *One Perſon*; Which this Learn-

ed Author, (though his Interpretation necessarily infers it, yet) cares not to affirm. As to the critical Distinction between εἷς and ἕν, the Truth is evidently This. Because every *Person* is a *Being*, but every *Being* is *not* a *Person*; therefore εἷς, which is of the more limited Signification, and expresses *intelligent Being* or *Person* only, can never possibly be extended to signify *Being* in general: But ἕν, which signifies *Being* in general, may also be used of *such a Being*, as is an *intelligent Being*, that is, *a Person*. Therefore τὸ γεννηθὲν and τὸ ἅγιον might properly be used by St *Matthew* and St *Luke*, as well as ὁ ἅγιος and ὁ γεννηθεὶς; because the Subject mentioned, (besides that perhaps τὸ παιδίον is referred to,) was equally both a *Holy Thing* and a *Holy Person*. But ἕν, in this place of St *John*, cannot signify *One Being*; because the Subject spoken of, being an *Intelligent* Being, it would consequently have meant the same as εἷς *One Person*: Which confessedly not being our Saviours intention to affirm, it follows of Necessity that the words must be understood figuratively, in the manner that has been above explained at large, *pag.* 144, *&c.*

See above, *pag.* 40.

pag. 113. *OBJ.* 'This Text, [*I and my Father are* '*One*,] Cannot be understood of Christ as '*Man*; it being always brought to prove,

'even

'even by the *Arians* themſelves, that Chriſt 'is *God*.

ANSW. This is no Objection againſt any thing I have affirmed. However, it deſerves to be taken notice of; that the Reader may obſerve, how apt even the moſt Learned and Able Writers ſometimes are, to uſe Arguments which conclude nothing. Becauſe the *Arians* allege This Text, to prove Chriſt to be *God* in their Senſe; does it therefore follow, that it *Cannot* be underſtood of him as *Man?* Do *Arians* never allege more Texts, than are concluſive of what they allege them for? And is it not at leaſt *Poſſible*, that Chriſt might mean the ſame, when he ſays, *I and my Father are One*; as when he ſays, *They* [the Diſciples] *may be One, even as We are One*; *I in Them, and Thou in Me, &c.* *Joh.* 17; 21, 23.

OBJ. 'Since the trueſt way of Under- *pag.* 113. 'ſtanding the meaning of *ſingle Texts* re- 'lating to the preſent Controverſy, is to 'conſider them ALL together in one 'View; I have added——SOME Paſſages 'of Scripture, in which the Father and 'Son are mentioned together, in ſuch a 'manner as to imply their Equality or 'Unity.

ANSW. Since the trueſt way of underſtanding the meaning of *ſingle Texts* relating to the preſent Controverſy, is to conſi-

der them ALL together in one View: This Learned Author would have done better, to have accordingly conſidered them ALL together, and compared them one with another, as *I* did; and not to have contented himſelf with collecting *SOME Paſſages* &c. There are in the New Teſtament, (as appears by my Collection in the Scripture-Doctrine,) *many Hundreds* of Texts, whereof he has not thought fit to take the leaſt Notice, which do all of them directly contradict His Notion. And of thoſe Texts which he himſelf *has* here collected, there is *not One* which expreſſes the Notion he alleges them for. Concerning the Form of Baptiſm, which is his principal Text, he
pag. 114. ſays only, *We may well SUPPOSE it to infer SOME Equality.* And *Many* of the very Texts he here cites, do themſelves prove juſt the contrary to what he brings them as proving. Particularly,

Joh. 14, 1. *Ye believe in* God; *believe* alſo *in* Me.

Joh. 17, 3. *Thee the* Only True God, *and* Jeſus Chriſt *whom Thou haſt* Sent.

1 *Th.* 5, 18. *This is the Will of* God, *in* Chriſt Jeſus.

2 *Th.* 2, 16. *Now our Lord* Jeſus Chriſt *himſelf, and* God *even our* Father.

1 *Tim.* 5, 21. *I charge thee before* God, *and the Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, *and the* elect Angels. [Theſe laſt words are omitted

ted in his Citation of this Text: Which they ſhould not have been; becauſe they ſhow that the word, *And*, upon which he lays great Streſs in the Form of Baptiſm, has no Weight in it to prove ſuch an Equality or Identity as he there contends for.]

Tit. 1, 2. *Peace from* God, *the* Father; *and the Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, *our* Saviour.

2 *Joh.* 3. *Peace from* God, *the* Father; *and from the Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, *the* Son of the Father.

Rev. 12, 10. *The Kingdom of our* God, *and the Power of HIS* Chriſt.

OBJ. There being many Paſſages, wherein Dr Clarke *owns it to be* 'doubtful or 'ambiguous whether the Father or Son be 'meant [*by the word, Lord*;] This is a very 'good Argument, that it is all one, of 'which thoſe paſſages are underſtood. pag. 122.

ANSW. The *Subject-matter* of ſome particular Texts, is indeed ſuch, as makes it ambiguous whether *Chriſt* or *God the Father* be ſpoken of in thoſe particular Texts. But it does not at all from thence follow, (which is the general Inference this Learned Author every where aims at,) that therefore in the whole Scripture there is no Diſtinction made between the Father and the Son. The word, *Lord*,

in *St Paul*'s Epistles, generally signifies *Christ*: And 'tis a manner of speaking intirely new in the Christian Church, to
pag. 122. say that thereby is meant *The One Supreme God, the God of Heaven and Earth, the God and Lord whom we Christians are to adore, without considering whether* the words *refer more properly to the Son or to the Father.* It is also to be observed, that *One* of the Texts he here cites, is by no means ambiguous; *Tit*, 2, 13, *The glorious appearing of the Great God.* For if he had cited the Whole text, *The glorious appearing of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ*; the Reader would naturally have perceived That to be the true Sense of it, which I have largely explained above, *pag.* 85. Yet This Text, and *Luke* 1, 16, (which is also largely explained above, *pag.* 119;) are the *Only Two* among the ambiguous Texts, wherein the word *God* is mentioned at all. The rest have only the word *Lord* in them. And therefore he had not sufficient ground
pag. 122. to say, *The GOD and Lord mentioned in these Texts &c.*

pag. 127. *OBJ. Though it is allowed, that* 'in 'the very Name of Father there is some-'thing of *Eminence*, which is not in That 'of Son; and some kind of *Priority* in 'Him whom we call the First, in respect

'of

' of Him whom we term the Second Per-
' son ; *yet* [*they are Both but One and the Same Individual Being.*] pag. 8, 105, 106, 110.

ANSW. This (I think) is an expreſs Contradiction : Nor does the Scripture any where ſpeak of them as of *One and the Same Individual Being.* The Texts which mention the Diſtinction of Perſons, are *innumerable :* The *ſingle* Text, [*I and my Father are One,*] has largely been proved above, *pag.* 144, 289, 291, not to mean *One and the Same Individual Being.*

OBJ. ' Though Two Men are indivi- pag. 127.
' dually diſtinct from one another, BE-
' CAUSE they are *Finite Beings*, *&c.*

ANSW. Two Men are individually diſtinct from one another, not *becauſe* they are *finite*, not *becauſe* they are temporary, nor *becauſe* of any other *Quality* whatſoever ; but becauſe they are *Two.* God is a Being *infinite* and *eternal :* Does it therefore follow that nothing can be *diſtinct* from him, becauſe his *Immenſity* includes all *Space*, and his *Eternity* exhauſts all *Duration* ? This Arguing, if it was *juſt*, (as indeed it is *no Argument* at all,) would lead further than this Learned Author ſeems to perceive.

OBJ. ' Neither is there any difference pag. 128.
' between us, concerning the proper Ho-
' nour

'nour due from Men to Each of theſe Per-
'ſons diſtinctly, SO FAR AS WE take
'Scripture for our Guide; becauſe all the
'Forms of ſpeaking uſed upon this Ac-
'count in Scripture, are tranſcribed into
'our Publick Devotions; as appears plain-
'ly from Dr *Clarke's* Collection of Paſſages
'out of our Liturgy, in the *Third Part* of
'his Book, § 1, 2, 3, 4, *and* 5. The Whole
'Diſpute THEN between us, is, concern-
'ing the metaphyſical Nature &c.

ANSW. Theſe words, if I underſtand their Meaning, are an expreſs Giving up of the whole Queſtion. For if *there is no Difference between us, SO FAR AS WE take Scripture for our Guide*; then Why ſhould any of us indeavour to *impoſe* his Opinion upon another, beyond the limits of this agreed Rule? And if *all the Forms of ſpeaking uſed upon this Account in Scripture, are tranſcribed into our Publick Devotions, in Thoſe Paſſages of the Liturgy which I cited in my Third Part*, § 1, 2, 3, 4 *and* 5; that is, in thoſe Paſſages which I cited as expreſſing clearly and explicitly the ſame Doctrine with mine: then Why ſhould this learned Author be diſpleaſed with any Man, for deſiring that theſe *unexceptionable Expreſſions*, which he allows to contain *All the Forms of ſpeaking uſed upon this Account in Scripture*, were *uniformly* adhered to; without the *Addition* of Any Others, more difficult

difficult to be underſtood, and more eaſy to be excepted againſt? Putting which caſe, the whole remaining Diſpute between us would THEN INDEED be only about Metaphyſical Speculations, and by all means to be wholly laid aſide as needleſs and of no importance.

Obj. 'That Father, Son, and Holy 'Ghoſt, are not three *Names* only, we all 'agree: But that they ſhould be Three dif- 'ferent *Beings*, I can no ways comprehend. *pag.* 129.

ANSW. This (I think) is an expreſs Contradiction: For between *Being* and *not Being* there can be no middle. Whatever is *not a Being*, is *no Being*; and whatever is *no Being*, can at moſt be only a *Name* or *Denomination*, a *Mode*, *Quality*, *Relation*, or the like; things which have no Exiſtence but in Our Conceptions, diſtinct from the Exiſtence of the *Subſtance* to which they belong. The Schoolmen have endeavoured to find out ſomething intermediate between *Being* and *not Being*, by means of what they call an *internal Production*: And the Learned *Bp. Bull* himſelf is forced finally to have recourſe to this unintelligible Term of Art, (*Sect.* 4, *cap.* 4,) in order to maintain an *Explication* of the Unity of God upon *ſuch a Foot*, as can very hardly be reconciled with his own Diſcourſe in the reſt of that excellent Section concerning the

the *Subordination of the Son.* For a *Subordination* of one Person to another, necessarily supposes the two Persons to be *distinct.* But now the Notion of *internal Production,* can in reality mean nothing else but to destroy That *Distinctness*; and consequently ends in an unavoidable Contradiction. For if *internal Production* was meant only in opposition to *being extrinsick to God*; in That Sense 'tis manifest that *internal Production* belongs equally to All Beings whatsoever; because *In Him All things have their Being*: But if *internal Production* means *such a Production,* as gives the thing produced *no distinct Existence of its own*; (which is what the Schoolmen aim at;) then 'tis manifest it signifies a *Production of Nothing,* that is, *No Production at all.* See a remarkable passage of *Justin Martyr* upon this Head, cited above, *pag.* 157, 158. Neither can it here reasonably be alledged, that these Expressions are *mysterious*: For though, if *God himself* had been pleased to reveal any thing in such Words as we could not distinctly understand, it would indeed have been *very reasonable* to believe firmly that those words had a distinct Meaning, though we apprehended it not: yet when *Men* invent Words, whose Signification They themselves cannot distinctly explain; it is then, on the other side, *no less reasonable*

nable to believe, that theſe words have really no ſignification at all.

OBJ. ‘ Dr *Clarke* aſſures us, *intelligent* pag. 131.
‘ *Being* and *Perſon* are equivalent Terms;
‘ though he oftentimes uſes the word, *Per-*
‘ *ſon*, as if they were not.

ANSW. Dr *Clarke* No-where uſes the word, *Perſon*, as if *intelligent Being* and *Perſon* were not equivalent Terms. In That expreſſion, (which is the *only one* I can think of, to which this Learned Author may here poſſibly allude,) that the Son appeared under the Old Teſtament *in the Perſon* of the Father; the meaning evidently is, that he appeared and ſpake, as *repreſenting the Perſon* of the Father.

OBJ. ‘ The Diſtinctions of *original* and pag. 135.
‘ *derived*, make no manner of Difference in
‘ our Notion of *Eternity*.

ANSW. The Queſtion is not about *Duration*, or any other *metaphyſical* Qualities, but about *Dominion and Authority*; which Alone is That which makes God to be *God*, (in the *moral* or *religious* ſenſe of the Word,) ὁ παντοκράτωρ, *Supreme over all*. For *Dominion* and *Duty* are *Relatives* between *Him that Governs* and *them which are governed*. *Metaphyſical* and *Abſolute* Qualities, may be Objects of *Admiration*; but *relative Dominion* only, is the Foundation of *Duty*.

Space

Space is *Eternal*, but it is not therefore *God*. If *Matter* were *Infinite* and *Eternal*, still it would not at all be *our God*. And if any other Being had any other Attributes whatsoever, yet still if it had not *Dominion* over *Us*, Neither should *We* owe any *Duty* to *It*. 'Tis *Dominion* only, that makes God to be *God* to *Us*; and therefore the Scripture so frequently uses the word παντοκράτωρ, *Supreme over all*, as equivalent to the Title, *God*. Now in the Notion of *Dominion*, 'tis very evident that *original* and *derived* are Distinctions which make a plain and necessary Difference. Which is all that I contend for.

pag. 134. *OBJ.* 'As to any *unscriptural Expressions* 'made use of for the Explication of this 'Doctrine; they may perhaps, in some Re- 'spects, be improper; and they OUGHT, 'as much as may be, to be avoided. But 'if this be all that Dr *Clarke* aims at, — to 'reduce the Doctrine of the Trinity within 'the bounds of Scripture, and to hold e- 'very body strictly to this Rule, so as not 'to allow them to add any Words or Ex- 'pressions of their own, or to draw any 'remote Consequences from those of Scrip- 'ture; why does he himself lay down such 'Propositions, and use such Terms and 'Forms of speaking, as are no where to be 'found in the Sacred Writings? —— Tis 'plain,

' plain, that Dr *Clarke's* Scripture-doctrine pag. 135.
' of the Trinity, is not the Doctrine of
' Chriſt and his Apoſtles, *declared Neceſſary*
' *in their OWN WORDS.*——Dr Clarke
' appears to be Self-condemned for uſing *un-* pag. 137.
' *ſcriptural Expreſſions*,——at the ſame time
' that he condemns——introducing the like
' *unſcriptural Expreſſions* into the *Publick*
' *Forms* of Faith and Worſhip.

ANSW. In *explaining of Scripture*, it is impoſſible not to uſe *unſcriptural Expreſſions*; but then thoſe *unſcriptural Expreſſions* are to be look'd upon only as the *private Opinions* of Men, and are of *no further Authority* than what the weight of *Reaſon and Argument* gives them. All that is deſirable in this caſe, is, that as few *unſcriptural Expreſſions* as poſſible, be uſed in *Creeds* or in ſuch other Forms, as are ſuppoſed to have an *Authority* in determining Mens Opinions, diſtinct from that of *mere Reaſon and Argument*. The Inconveniences of which, are very largely and learnedly ſet forth by *Bp. Taylor*, in his *Liberty of Prophecying*, and in his *Epiſtle* before it. God forbid that I ſhould ever deſire any *Explication* or *Opinion* of mine, ſo far as the *Expreſſions* are *unſcriptural*, to be lookt upon as *Neceſſary* Doctrine. Nothing is *Neceſſary*, but what *God* has made ſo: Nothing is *Neceſſary*, but what *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, have taught *in their own words*. Men ought

to

to indeavour to *explain* these Doctrines to Themselves and Others; and in such Explications there is no hurt in using (nay, Men cannot but use) *unscriptural Expressions*. But then all such Explications ought to be lookt upon only as *Humane Opinions*, not as of *Authority* to determine Mens *Faith*, but as Assistances to convince their *Reason and Judgment*. And then *all Controversies* would either soon be at an End; or (which is as well,) would do no hurt to any sincere Christian.

pag. 138. *OBJ.* 'If those Expressions which the 'Arians first presumed to introduce, are 'unjustifiable Phrases:—Why may we not 'as well use the [*contrary*] positive Expressi-'ons, as condemn the other; when, if the 'former be false, (and if they are not, they 'should not be condemned,) the latter must 'needs be true, as being directly contra-'dictory to them?

ANSW. Of two contradictory Propositions, one indeed must of necessity be true, and the other false. But does it from thence follow, that if a Mans affirming *one thing* be justly blameable, as being a *presuming to be wise above what is written*, and an *intruding into things which he hath not seen*; therefore it will presently be right and commendable to *affirm* and *impose* the *Contrary*? Are there not many cases in Nature,

ture, wherein it would be preſumptuous to determine with too much aſſurance, on either ſide of a Queſtion? and much more ſo, to impoſe ſuch Determinations upon Others?

OBJ. 'We may as well preſume to ſay, that Chriſt is, by an ineffable Communication of *the Divine Nature*, God; 'as that he is, by an ineffable Communication of *Divine Powers and Dignity*, 'God. pag. 132

ANSW. There is This Difference between the Two Manners of Expreſſion; that the *latter* is *very clear and intelligible*, the *former* is *very dark and ambiguous*. For if by the *Divine Nature* be meant *Divine Powers*, *Dominion and Dignity*; then they are only Two different manners of expreſſing One and the Same Thing. But if by *The Divine Nature* be meant (as this Learned Author ſeems to underſtand it,) individually *God himſelf*; then the Father's *communicating the Divine Nature* to the Son, is as much as to ſay, his *communicating HIMSELF* [*his individual Self*] to the Son. Which, far from being an *Explication* of Scripture, is on the contrary infinitely *harder* to underſtand, than any thing we meet withal in Scripture.

pag. 140. *OBJ.* 'Though we ought not to pre-
'ſume to explain, *in what manner* Chriſt
'derived his Being, Power, Knowledge,
'and other Attributes and Authority from
'the Father; yet we ought to explain
'WHAT BEING he derived; whether
'the SAME or another, &c.

ANSW. That is to ſay: We ought to explain whether Chriſt derived from the Father, *THE FATHERS Being*, or his *OWN Being*. I could not have imagined that This was a Queſtion which needed any Explication. But this Learned Author determines it (*pag.* 141,) that the *Son's Being is the ſame with the Father's*; that is, that the *Son's Being* is the *Father's Being*. Which, I acknowledge, is what I cannot underſtand.

pag. 141. *OBJ.* 'That Chriſt is the *Same* God
'with the Father, is a *plain* Propoſition,
'not embarraſſed with any Expreſſions of
'difficult and dubious Meaning.——And
'we have neither Precept nor Example to
'warrant us in the paying any *kind or de-*
'*gree* of Worſhip or Honour, upon a re-
'ligious Account, to any other Being what-
'ſoever.

ANSW. That there is but *One God*; and *Whom* the Scriptures expreſsly declare to be

That

That One God; and *how Christ* is nevertheless consistently stiled *God*; I have shown at large in my *Scripture-Doctrine*, and in the fore-going Papers. Whether this Learned Author's Notion be more *plain*, and less *embarrassed with difficult and dubious Expressions*, I leave our Readers to judge. As to the Question concerning *Worship*, I only repeat That Text before-cited, *Rev.* 1, 5, *Unto him that loved us and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests to God and his Father, to Him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever:* And *ch.* 5, 9, *Thou wast Slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy Blood,——and hast made us to our God Kings and Priests:——Worthy is the Lamb that was slain:——Blessing and Honour——be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever:* And I ask, whether here be not a *kind or degree of Worship*, plainly paid to Christ *upon a religious Account*; which is different from the Worship paid to *God the Father*, and which cannot possibly be paid to *God the Father*, any more than the Worship of *God the Father* can be paid to the *Lamb that was Slain?*

OBJ. 'Hereticks will not be kept within the Rule of Scripture, by a *bare* Con- pag. 142.

'demnation of their Opinions, but will 'continue to use such unscriptural Expressions as are brought for the Defense of 'their Errours; notwithstanding their being required by those in Power to forbear 'the Use of them. If Dr *Clarke* be of 'another Opinion, I wish, for our Conviction, this Method were Now taken; '&c.

ANSW. I am entirely of Opinion, that whosoever is not willing to *forbear* the Use of *any unscriptural Expression* whatsoever, which happens at any Time to give Offense to the Church, and is *barely forbidden* by his Superiours; is a very bad Christian. And if This Method *only*, had always been taken on all sides, without imposing *contrary unscriptural Expressions*; I am fully perswaded it would have prevented numberless Controversies in the Christian World, and been of infinite Benefit to the Church. As to the words, *Hereticks* and *Heresies*, which (since the first and purest Ages) have been so perpetually abused in an *unscriptural* Sense, to signify only *Differences of Opinion*, (though *This Learned Author* is indeed generally very Candid in forbearing uncharitable Censures;) I shall only add That wise Sentence of the Learned and Pious *Bishop Taylor*, in the *Epistle* before his *Liberty of Prophesying*:

Propheſying: I am ſure, ſays he, *that I know what* Drunkenneſs *&c, is*; *but I am not ſure that Such an Opinion is* Hereſy; *Neither would Other Men be ſo ſure as they think for, if they did conſider it aright, and obſerve the infinite Deceptions, and Cauſes of Deceptions, in wiſe Men, and in moſt Things, and in all doubtful Queſtions*; *and that they did not miſtake Confidence for Certainty.* His large Diſcourſe upon the ſame Subject, in the *Second Section* of his *Liberty of Propheſying*, is alſo well worth the peruſal of every ſerious and ſober-minded Man.

And now, having given a diſtinct and (I hope) ſatisfactory Anſwer to all the Objections that have hitherto been urged againſt me: I take leave upon this occaſion to declare once for all; that as I have upon mature and long Conſideration, and with the utmoſt Sincerity, drawn up my Thoughts upon This Subject, and laid them before the Publick, with my Reaſons for them, as clearly as I am able; ſo I willingly ſubmit what I have written, to the judgment of every honeſt and impartial Reader, who is capable of examining things of this Na-

ture. To whom, if what I have offered has Weight and Truth on its side, it will, I make no doubt, approve itself: If it has not, I am content it should find no better Reception than it deserves. I desire not, to *impose* my Opinion upon any Man; but only to prevail with Men to *study the Scripture*, and to make *It* their *only Rule* in matters of Revelation; and that inquisitive Persons would be pleased to *Compare* what *has been* or *shall be objected* against me, with what I have said either in *Answer to*, or in order to *obviate*, such Objections. It would be endless for me to repeat the same things again and again, as often as any one shall please to tell the World he differs from me, without offering any *New* Arguments for such his Opinion. Whenever either my own further Searches, or the learned Enquiries of Others, convince me that I am mistaken in my present Notions, I shall think my self obliged to own it to the World. In the mean time I hope I may without Offense desire, that if I am *Silent* hereafter, it may be interpreted as a Declaration, that I see no reason to change my Sentiments. I have no Concern, but for Truth; and from whatever hand it comes, shall readily receive it: But what is not Truth, or does not to me appear so, I cannot embrace. And This I shall for

the

the future think I ſufficiently declare, by giving no Anſwer to any thing that ſhall be writ; which, upon a careful Examination, I cannot find to contain Arguments either in themſelves *really weighty*, or at leaſt *not clearly anſwered already*.

ERRATA.

Page.	Line.	
125,	31.	Greatneſs
141,	17.	poſſibly
219,	5.	unanſwerable
250,	13.	itſelf
270,	1.	cited;) does

ADVER-

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Third Volume of the *MEMOIRS OF LITERATURE* for the Year 1713; containing an Account of the *Present State of Learning*, both at Home and Abroad, is now compleat with an Index to it.

The *Memoirs* for *January*, *February*, and *March*, of this present Year 1714; contain, besides an Account of some Books published in *England*, and consequently better known than foreign Books: I. An Account of Dr *Vitringa*'s Commentary upon *Isaiah*. II. An Account of some Dissertations upon several Subjects relating to Religion and Philology, by Mr *Hewet*, heretofore Bishop of *Auranches*. III. A Letter written by a Professor in the University of *Alcala*, concerning a Method of Reading the *Hebrew* Tongue without Points. IV. An Account of Mr *Basnage*'s Critical Remarks upon the Republick of the *Hebrews*. V. An Account of *Jerome of Prague*'s Trial. VI. An Account of a *Treatise of the Gout, containing an easy and infallible Method of curing it, tried by the Author himself, who was afflicted with that Disease*. VII. An Account of some other foreign Books, which are omitted here for Brevity-sake. VIII. Several Pieces of News relating to Learning.

This last Article contains, the Projects of three several Works, to be published by Mr *Chamberlaine*, Mr *Disney*, and another *English* Gentleman. 2. A short Account of the following Books. Philologia Biblica. Observationes Sacræ ad Evangelium Matthæi, by Mr *Olearius*. A New Edition of *Kepler*'s Works. Father *Calmet*'s Literal Commentary upon the *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, *the Song of Songs*, and *the Wisdom of Solomon*. De Linguæ Latinæ in Germania per amplius XVII sæcula fatis Commentarii. De Hypocrisi Gentilium circa cultum Deorum Schediasma Literarium. 3. Several other new Things of the same Nature.

These *Memoirs*, printed for the Author, may be had of the Booksellers of *London* and *Westminster*, and at the News-Shops at *Temple-Bar* and *Charing-Cross*.

BOOKS

BOOKS Written by the Reverend Dr *Clarke*; And Printed for *James Knapton*, at the *Crown* in St *Paul*'s Church-Yard.

A Diſcourſe concerning the *Being and Attributes of God*, the *Obligations of Natural Religion*, and the Truth and Certainty of the *Chriſtian Revelation*. In Anſwer to Mr. *Hobbs*, *Spinoza*, the *Author of the Oracles of Reaſon*, and other Deniers of Natural and Revealed Religion. Being ſixteen Sermons preach'd at the Cathedral-Church of St. *Paul*, in the Years 1704, and 1705. at the Lecture founded by the Honourable *Robert Boyle* Eſq; pr. 6 *s*.

A Paraphraſe on the Four *Evangeliſts*. Wherein, for the clearer Underſtanding the Sacred Hiſtory, the whole Text and Paraphraſe are printed in ſeparate Columns over-againſt each other. Together with critical Notes on the more difficult Paſſages. Very uſeful for Families. In two Volumes, 8*vo*. The Second Edition. pr. 12 *s*.

Three Practical Eſſays on Baptiſm, Confirmation, and Repentance: Containing full Inſtructions for a holy Life, with earneſt Exhortations, eſpecially to young Perſons, drawn from the Conſideration of the Severity of the Diſcipline of the Primitive Church. The third Edition. This new Edition makes 11 Sheets in Twelves, on good Paper, and a fair Letter. pr. 1 *s*. and for the Encouragement of the Charitable, 112 for 5 *l*. bound.

A Letter to Mr. *Dodwell*; Wherein all the Arguments in his *Epiſtolary Diſcourſe* againſt the Immortality of the Soul, are particularly anſwered, and the Judgment of *the Fathers* concerning that matter truly repreſented. Together with *Four Letters* in Anſwer to the Author of Remarks on the Letter to *Mr Dodwel*. To which is added, Some Reflexions on that Part of a Book called *Amyntor*, or, The Defence of *Milton*'s Life, which relates to the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, and the Canon of the New Teſtament. pr. 5 *s*.

The

The great Duty of universal Love and Charity. A Sermon preached before the Queen, at St. *James's* Chapel, pr. 6 *d.*

A Sermon preach'd at the Lady *Cooke's* Funeral, pr. 1 *d.*

A Sermon preach'd before the House of Commons, pr. 2 *d.*

A Sermon preach'd before the Queen on the 8th of March, 1709-10. pr. 2 *d.*

A Sermon preach'd at St. *James's* Church on the Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 7th, 1710. pr. 3 *d.*

The Government of Passion. A Sermon preach'd before the Queen at St *James's* Chapel. pr. 3 *d.*

Jacobi Rohaulti Physica. Latine vertit, recensuit, & uberioribus jam Annotationibus ex illustrissimi *Isaaci Neutoni* Philosophia maximam partem hausti, amplificavit & ornavit *S. Clarke.* Accedunt etiam in hac tertia Editione, novæ aliquot Tabulæ æri incisæ; & Annotationes multum sunt auctæ, 8*vo.* Price 8 *s.*

Is. Neutoni Optice. Latinè reddidit *S. Clarke,* S. T. P.

The *Scripture-Doctrine* of the Trinity. In Three Parts. Wherein all the *Texts* in the New Testament relating to that Doctrine, and the principal Passages in the Liturgy of the Church of *England,* are collected, compared, and explain'd. pr. 6 *s.*

A Letter to the Reverend Dr *Wells,* Rector of *Cotesbach* in *Leicestershire.* In Answer to his Remarks, *&c.* Price 1 *s.*

The Rights of the Clergy of the Christian Church: Or, A Discourse shewing, that God has given and appropriated to the Clergy, Authority to Ordain, Baptize, preach, preside in Church-Prayer, and Consecrate the Lord's Supper. Wherein also the pretended Divine Right of the Layety to Elect, either the Persons to be Ordained, or their own particular Pastors, is Examined and Disproved. By *Thomas Bennet,* M. A. Rector of St. *James's* in *Colchester.* pr. 5 *s.*

A Paraphrase and Annotations on the Book of Common-Prayer, 8*vo.* pr. 4 *s.*

A Letter to Mr. *Benjamin Robinson,* on his Review of Liturgies and their Imposition. pr. 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

A Second Letter to Mr. *Robinson.* pr. 1 *s.*

BOOKS

BOOKS Written by the Reverend Mr. *Hoadly*; and Printed for *James Knapton*, at the *Crown* in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard.

THE *Measures of Submission* to the Civil Magistrate consider'd. In a Defense of the Doctrine deliver'd in a Sermon preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of *London*, *Sept.* 29. 1705. The Fourth Edition. In which are added, 1. An *Accession-Sermon*, preached *March* 8. 1704-5. 2. A Sermon concerning the *Unhappiness* of *Absolute Monarchy*, &c. 3. A Sermon concerning St. *Paul*'s *Behaviour* towards the *Civil Magistrate*: pr. 3 *s.*

The Original and Institution of *Civil Government* Discuss'd; *viz.* I. An *Examination* of the *Patriarchal Scheme* of *Government*. II. A *Defense of* Mr. *Hooker*'s *Judgment*, &c. against the *Objections* of several *late Writers*. To which is added, A Large Answer to Dr. *F. Atterbury*'s *Charge* of *Rebellion*: In which the *Substance* of his late *Latin Sermon* is produced, and fully examined. The Second Edition. pr. 5 *s.*

Several Discourses concerning the Terms of Acceptance with God. In which, 1. The Terms themselves are distinctly laid down; as they are proposed to Christians in the New Testament. And, 2. Several false Notions of the Conditions of Salvation are considered, particularly of being saved by Faith. Of trusting to external performances. Of the power of Charity to cover Sins. Of relying upon the Merits of Christ. Of Man's Weakness, and God's Grace. Of Repentance. Of the Example of the Thief upon the Cross. Of trusting to a Death-bed Sorrow. Of the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard. Of depending upon Amendment in Time to come. pr. 5 *s.*

The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of *England*. In two Parts. With the Defense of it; and the *Persuasive* to *Lay-Conformity*. The Third Edition. To which is added, The brief Defense of *Episcopal Ordination*. Together with the *Reply* to the *Introduction* to the *Second Part*; and a *Postscript* relating to the *Third Part*, of Mr. *Calamy*'s Defense of *Moderate Non-conformity*. pr. 6 *s.*

An

AN INDEX OF THE TEXTS Explained in This BOOK.

	Page
Matt. VI, 9.	114
XII, 31.	189
XIX, 17.	39, 89
XXVIII, 19.	204
Mark XII, 29.	48
XII, 32.	51
XIII, 32.	171

Luke

Luke I; 16, 17. 119
IV, 18. 181

John I, 1. 67, 126
I, 3. 131
III, 5. 186
III, 6. 187
V, 18. 132
VIII, 58. 141
X, 30. 55, 144
X, 33. 136, 144
XII, 41. 155
XIV, 9. 198
28. 172
XVII, 3. 56
XX, 28. 67

Acts V; 3, 4. 73
VII; 30, 31, 32. 161
XX, 28. 127
XXVIII; 25, 26, 27. 182

Rom. IX, 5. 68, 86
XI, 36. 93
XIV; 9, 10, 11, 12. 166

1 Cor. VIII; 4, 5, 6. 68, 94
XIII, 12. 198

2 Cor. III; 17, 18. 192

Gal. III, 28. 43, 44
IV, 8. 76

Eph. IV, 6. 95

Phil. II; 6, 7. 140, 173
II, 9. 232, 233

Col. I, 15. 175

1 Tim. I, 1. 84, 85
II, 5. 115
III, 16. 86

Tit. II, 13. 85, 96
III; 4, 6. 84, 85

1 Theſſ. III; 12, 13. 203

2 Theſſ. III, 5. 204

Heb. I; 8, 9. 12, 87
III; 3, 4, 5, 6. 81
XIII, 8. 169

2 Pet. I, 1. 83
II, 1. 110

1 John V, 7. 206
1 John V; 20, 21. 96

Jude

Jude 4. 109

Rev. I, 5. 118
XXII, 9. 117

FINIS.

A

LETTER

TO THE

Reverend Dr *WELLS*,

Rector of *Cotesbach* in *Leiceſterſhire*.

In ANSWER to his

REMARKS, &c.

LIBRARY OF PRINC
OCT 31 19
THEOLOGICAL SEM

By *SAMUEL CLARKE*, D. D.
Rector of St *James's Weſtminſter*, and
Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majeſty.

LONDON,

Printed for *James Knapton*, at the *Crown*
in St *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1714.

Price One Shilling.

A

LETTER

TO THE

Reverend Dr *WELLS*, &c.

SIR,

MY Book, entitled *The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, had been publiſhed above a Year and half, and nothing came out * againſt it but Pamphlets ſet forth by ſuch *Unintelligible* Writers, as I thought might well be left to the *common Senſe* even of the meaneſt Readers to judge of, without my interpoſing any further. The Name and Character which Dr *Wells* had acquired in the World, by his Writings in ſome other Controverſies, and by his Books relating to other parts of Learning; raiſed in me an Expectation of ſomething more conſiderable from *Him*, and ſomething

* For, as to the Books publiſhed not againſt my *Argument*, but againſt *Me*; I refer to my Introduction, *pag.* 24 *and* 25.

which might well deserve more particular Notice. Upon which Account, though your Remarks, when they came out, did not answer the Opinion I had conceived of your Abilities, yet I thought fit to send you the following *Observations* upon them.

pag. 1. You begin with this Question: *Upon reading these Words of the Doctor,* [viz. *that he "had collected ALL the Texts that re- "late to the Doctrine of the Trinity";*] *might not one have Reasonably expected, that the Dr had collected the Texts of the* OLD *as well as New Testament, relating to the said Doctrine? For is not the* OLD *Testament a* Part *of Scripture, as well as the New?*

pag. 2. Again; *The Dr ought at least to have given some satisfactory Reason, why he took not the like Notice of the Texts of the* Old

pag. 3. *Testament as of the New.* Again; *It remains incumbent upon him, to give the Publick a satisfactory Reason, why he did not collect All the Texts of the* Old *Testament, as well as of the New, that relate to the Trinity.* Now I did imagine, Sir, when I published my Book, you might easily have guessed what my Reason was, why I alleged no Texts out of the *Old* Testament. But, since I perceive you cannot discover it, I will for once endeavour to explain it to you. My Reason was, because, though there are indeed in the Old Testament innumerable

numerable Texts, which contain Prophecies concerning the *Perſon* and *Character*, the *Office*, *Power* and *Dominion* of *Chriſt* the *Meſſiah*; yet *there is No Text* in the *Old* Teſtament, wherein the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is revealed. *You yourſelf* have alleged none: Nor have I ſeen any alleged by *Others*, from whence any Argument can be drawn at all concluſive. If you think the Word, אלהים, implies a Plurality of Perſons; the contrary is evident from many Paſſages, wherein you muſt of neceſſity allow it can ſignify but One. Thus, *Pſal.* 45; 6, 7, *Thy Throne, O God,* [אלהים,] *is for ever and ever*;—— *Thou haſt loved Righteouſneſs*; *Therefore GOD,* [אלהים,] *even THY GOD, hath anointed thee*, &c. Certainly, neither in *Solomon*, to whom the Jews applied the Word [אלהים] in the firſt Part of this Paſſage; neither in the *Son of God*, to whom the Apoſtle applies it; neither in *God the Father*, to whom it is applied in the ſecond Part; can there be ſaid to be a Plurality of Perſons. And as to thoſe Paſſages, wherein Chriſt is repreſented as appearing to the Patriarchs, ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, *in the Form of God*, in the *Name* and *Authority*, and with the *Power* and *Glory* of *his Father*; being ſtiled, at the ſame time, both *God* and *the Angel of GOD*; I have already conſidered and explained them in my

Scripture-

Scripture-Doctrine, *pag.* 102, 105, 114, *and* 369.

However; becauſe you could not (it ſeems) gueſs at *This Reaſon* of my not citing a number of Texts out of the Old Teſtament, you kindly ſuggeſt for me *Another Reaſon*; viz. that I *underſtood not the Original Revelation, or Hebrew and Chaldee Languages wherein the Old Teſtament was Originally written.* Suppoſe now, Sir, I ſhould inſinuate to my Readers, becauſe *You* have offered no Objections againſt my Expoſition of the ſeveral Texts in the *New Teſtament*, that therefore *You underſtand not the Original Revelation, or the Greek Language wherein the New Teſtament was Originally written*; Would you Think, that, in ſuch an Inſinuation, I acted the part of a reaſonable Man and a Scholar? And is it not in *Yourſelf* a Sign of great Want of Arguments relating to the Merits of the Cauſe, when you are forced to deſcend to ſo mean a Suggeſtion, (concerning One who has not the Honour to be perſonally known to you,) as that I undertook to collect *All* the Texts concerning a particular Subject out of the *Whole* Scripture, without ſo much as underſtanding the Languages wherein more than *One Half* of the Scripture was written? What degree of knowledge I have in thoſe Languages, it would

pag. 3.

would no more *become Me* to boaſt in this place; than it *became You* to ſuggeſt, (without knowing any thing of the Matter,) that I had No knowledge in them. Had you alleged any *particular Texts*, as contradicting (in the True Rendring of the *Hebrew*) any thing that I had aſſerted; you might have expected I ſhould have taken particular Notice of ſuch Texts. But to a *general* Suggeſtion, that there are in the Old Teſtament many Paſſages againſt me; I can only make a *general* Reply, that upon the carefulleſt Search I find no ſuch Paſſages there.

But the Reaſon (it ſeems) why you alleged no particular Texts, was, becauſe there had already *come forth a Book, under the ſame Title* you *had deſigned for* your *Treatiſe*; [viz. *The True Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*;] *which though but a Part of what was deſigned, yet carries in it Alone a SUFFICIENT ANSWER to* Dr Clarke's *Book: Upon the Sight whereof* you *rejoiced, as on other Accounts, ſo particularly becauſe* you *were hereby excuſed from giving* yourſelf *any Further Trouble, as to what was contained in the* Body *of* Dr Clarke's *Book.* I profeſs, Sir, when I firſt read this Paſſage of yours, I could hardly perſwade myſelf but that I had ſome way or other miſtaken your meaning, and that it was impoſſible

Preface, pag. 2.

Preface, pag. 1.

Dr

Dr *Wells* ſhould commend That Book. But ſo it is: The Book which Dr *Wells* here recommends ſo ſeriouſly, and with a Pro-
pag. 66. feſſion that he is *Not in the leaſt Aſhamed to Own Publickly his Name*; is a Book written by ſome *Roſecrucian* Author, turning all Religion (though poſſibly not ſo intended by the Author himſelf,) into manifeſt Ridicule. I had thought it a ſhame to take any Notice of ſo ſtrange a Writer, and was willing to have paſſed him by in Silence: But ſince ſo learned a Man as Dr *Wells*, has in earneſt, (if indeed it be in earneſt,) recommended the Book as *a SUFFICIENT ANSWER to* Dr Clarke's *Book*; and ſince thoſe who never ſaw the Book, may poſſibly be induced, upon Dr *Wells*'s Authority, to think there may be ſome Argument in it; The Reader will pardon me if I give him a ſhort Specimen, what Kind of a Writer it is, that he finds thus recommended to him.

---

pag. 54. " Gen. 14; 19, 20. *Bleſſed be Abram of the*
" *moſt High* God, *poſſeſſour of Heaven and*
" *Earth: And Bleſſed be the moſt high* God.
" THUS the Church of England; O *Holy*
" Trinity, *have mercy upon us.*

pag. 55. " Gen. 21, 33. *Abraham——called there on*
" *the Name of the* Lord, *the everlaſting* God.
" Hebrew

" Hebrew is, קָרָא בְּשֵׁם. I take it to signi-
" fy, *preached in the Name.* But if the lear-
" ned will rather have קָרָא to signify, *cal-*
" *ling upon*, that is, *praying to*; THEN it will
" follow, that they worshipped the *Trinity*
" in the Name of the Mediatour, OR the
" Father in the Name of the Son.

" His being the Word or Son of God, does *pag.* 62.
" not take away from his being THAT
" very God, whose Word or Son he is.

" Gen. 4, 3. — *An Offering unto the* Lord. *pag.* 69.
" *Heb.* Jehovah.
" *Note*; The Holy Ghost SEEMS to have
" been adored HERE, as One with the Fa-
" ther and the Son.

" Gen. 24, 26. *Bowed his Head, and wor-* *pag.* 76.
" *shipped the* Lord, *and said*; *Blessed be the*
" Lord God *of my Master Abraham.*
" *Note*; This SEEMS to have been an
" Act of Worship to the *whole Trinity*, by the
" Mediation of the Son. FOR it seems to
" have been the *Spirit*, that first moved Abra-
" ham to leave his Country; And it was the
" *Son* who appeared to him; — And it seems
" to have been the *Father* who is said to have
" Sworn to him. Now SINCE Abraham
" was justified by Faith in Christ, and
" SINCE This Faith teaches us to address
" the Deity as Three in One by the Media-
" tour; it cannot be thought unreasonable to
" assert This.

pag. 79. " *Cain* was rejected, becauſe he had not
" the Faith which made *Abel* accepted. ——
" It is certain he did not offer to the *Trinity*:
" For had he believed Three Perſons, he
" MUST alſo have believed that the Son
" would one day become Man, and atone for
" his Sins; AND have been juſtified by
" That-Faith, as well as *Abel*.

pag. 81. " Gen. 28, 21. *The* Lord *ſhall be my* God.
" The Trinity in Unity, by the Mediati-
" on of the Son.

pag. 85. " Rev. 1, 8. *Which is and which was and*
" *which is to come.* The Greek is, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν
" καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος; Which may be thus rendred,
" *Ille Ens tàm qui fuit quàm qui erit*, The Is-
" ing both which was and which will be.

pag. 89. " Joh. 17; 18, 19. *As thou haſt Sent me*
" *into the World, even ſo——for their Sakes*
" *I* ſanctify myſelf.
" *That is*; SEND myſelf.

pag. 98 & 99. " I would here propoſe to the Learned,
" whether we may not take the words, *HOLY*
" *FATHER*, in the Prayer of our Saviour,
" *Joh.* 17, 11, to be ſpoken to the Deity in
" the Perſon of the *HOLY GHOST*, as
" well as of the *FATHER*.—— The words
" ſeem capable of This Paraphraſe: *O GOD*,
" *keep*

" *keep Thou in thine own Name or Power* IN
" *THE PERSON OF THE HOLY*
" *GHOST, thoſe whom Thou in the PER-*
" *SON OF THE FATHER, haſt gi-*
" *ven Me the SON of Thee* O *FATHER,*
" *and of Thee* O *HOLY SPIRIT.*

" If we render with the 70 and vulgar *pag.* 106.
" Verſion, *Pſ.* 24, 7, *O ye Princes, liſt up your*
" *Gates*, (or Portcullices which were drawn
" up;) One may rationally conclude, that
" during our LORD's continuance upon
" Earth, the Celeſtial Government was *in*
" *Commiſſion*, and managed by Angels; who
" were THUS taught to know his Perſon
" again, as being the ſame Jehovah who laid
" down That Shecinah, and now is in our
" Nature.

" Job 12, 12. *With the Antient, is Wiſdom*; *pag.* 135.
" [*and in length of days, Underſtanding.*]
" Heb. *With the ANTIENTS is WIS-*
" *DOM:* That is, *With the Father and Son,*
" *is the Holy Spirit.* Note here, *the Unity of*
" *the Nature of the Three Perſons, proving the*
" *Exiſtence of the Son to be without dividing the*
" *Nature, as calling both the Father and Son by*
" *the ſame Name* ANTIENTS.

" Job 31; 1, 2. *Why then ſhould I look up* *pag.* 137.
" *on a Maid?*
" *For what portion of God is there*, &c.
" I render, as in the Heb *And what ſhould*
" *I conſider in the Virgin, even what is the Part*

" *of God &c.* It is DIFFICULT to put any
" other conſtruction on the Words than This,
" which ſhew *Job*'s humble Faith, without cu-
" rious ſearching into the myſterious Incarna-
" tion of God the Son, who was the Almigh-
" ty, born of a Virgin, by the Power of the
" Higheſt, that is, the Holy Ghoſt.

pag. 144. " Job 12, 12. *With the Antients is Wiſdom.*
" Heb. *IN the Antients is Wiſdom*; That is,
" *In the Father and the Son is the Holy Ghoſt.*
" Note; The Originating of the Spirit of
" God, is here declared to be a diſtinction in
" Perſon, but not a diviſion in Nature. He
" is ſaid to be, *IN the Antients*, not *OUT*
" *OF the Antients*; that is, One with them
" in Nature.

pag. 149. " Job 1, 24. *The Name of the* Lord.
" Heb. *The Name Jehovah:* That is, the
" Son of God, in whom the Trinity is wor-
" ſhipped, and CONSEQUENTLY the
" Notice thereof is implyed in This Expreſ-
" ſion.

ibid. " Job 11, 7. *Canſt thou by ſearching find out*
" *God.*
" The Oeconomy of our Salvation (as it
" appears from other places) was known at
" this Time; And THEN we may fately
" take the Title, GOD, in This place, for
" the Holy Trinity.

" Paſſages

" Paſſages in *Job*, in which is declared pag. 150.
" what Worſhip was in His days paid to the
" Holy *Trinity*.
" Job 1, 21. *Bleſſed be the Name of the*
" LORD.
" 11, 13. *Stretch out thine Hands towards*
" HIM.
" 15, 3. *Calleth upon* GOD.
" 15, 20. *Mine Eye poureth out Tears to*
" GOD.
" 22, 23. *Lift up thy Face to* GOD.
" 33. 29. *All theſe things worketh* GOD
" OFTENTIMES. *Heb. is*, God in
" three Proceedings, *in*, *with*, *or by the Mighty*
" *One*.

" The Penitent Believer is pardoned by pag. 180.
" *God the Father* as of *RIGHT*, though
" This *Right* is obtained by the *Free Grace* of
" * *God the Son*. So that, though we are
" *FREELY* pardoned, yet this Pardon to
" the Penitent is *DUE*.

* *It ſeems then, in this Author's Syſtem of Divinity, there is no Free Grace at all, of* God the Father.

And Now, is not This indeed a *Worthy Anſwerer*, as Dr *Wells* ſtiles him, *pag.* 2d *of his Preface?* And was it not very reaſonably to be expected, that I ſhould have written a Book in Reply to ſo Worthy an Author?

thor? Indeed, I ſhould Now have been very much aſhamed to have tranſcribed ſuch *fooliſh* (not to ſay *profane*) Stuff, had not ſo conſiderable a Man as Dr *Wells* has been thought to be, ſoberly affirmed that *it carries in it Alone a SUFFICIENT ANSWER to Dr* Clarke's *Book: Upon the Sight whereof* he *rejoiced, as on Other Accounts, ſo particularly becauſe* he *was hereby excuſed from giving* himſelf *any further Trouble, as to what was contained in the Body of Dr* Clarke's *Book.*

Pref. pag. 2.

What you lay down, *pag.* 6 *and* 7, concerning the *Uſe of Reaſon* in reading the Scriptures, is very *True*, but proves nothing againſt *Me.* For, the Inference you draw, *viz.* that *Reaſon* directs Men to uſe the Aſſiſtance of the Primitive Fathers in underſtanding the Scripture, is what I readily allow; and I add, that it directs them likewiſe, according to the beſt of their Capacities, to uſe the Aſſiſtance of Modern Commentators, and other Learned Divines. But if you mean that the Primitive Fathers have any *Authority* to determine Mens Judgment concerning the Senſe of Scripture, any further than the *Reaſons* they allege, convince Men that ſuch or ſuch an Interpretation is indeed the True Meaning of the Text; this I can by no means aſſent to. And, ſuppoſing their *Authority* to be what

what you pleaſe; yet that their *Judgment* is *againſt Me* in the preſent Controverſy, as you moſt unreaſonably Suppoſe without any Proof throughout your whole Book, and as an unlearned Reader muſt needs, by your frequent and poſitive repeating of it, be led to imagine; this (though you muſt take notice it is no part of the Queſtion,) is what I abſolutely deny. Concerning which matter, I ſhall have occaſion preſently to ſpeak more particularly.

You affirm, that *a Supernatural Truth may not be ſo clearly Revealed in Scripture, as to leave no room for doubting What is the true Senſe of Scripture concerning it: Namely, becauſe Divine Providence may have provided ſuch external Helps, as Reaſon (if duly attended to, and its Dictates not overruled by Prejudice or the like,) will tell us are Proper and Sufficient to determine the True Senſe of Scripture in the point controverted.* And, (*pag.* 13,) that *the Scripture is not in itſelf ſo clear as to the Doctrine of the Trinity, but to require the Taking in of external Helps, to decide the True Senſe of it.* pag. 9.

That *the Beſt Aſſiſtances* (pag. 13) *are to be procured from thoſe Antient Writers that lived in the Firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, that is, before or at the Council of Nice*: That *the Teſtimonies of the Antient Writers*

(pag.

(pag. 18) *muſt in reaſon be acknowledged to be the Beſt PROOFS, that Texts are really* Proofs *of what they are brought to* prove ; *And whoſoever refuſes to admit of the Teſtimonies of the Antient Writers, as the Beſt Proofs in deciding the True Senſe of Scripture ; does in effect take upon himſelf alone to decide the ſame by a bare* Teſte Meipſo : That *there is a rational Expedient* (pag. 21) *preſerved by the good Providence of God, namely by* Referring *the Cauſe to be Decided by the Teſtimony of the Primitive Church, that is, by the Concurrent Teſtimony of thoſe Antient Writers that lived in the Three firſt Ages of Chriſtianity :* That *a Mans Beſt Underſtanding* (pag. 25) *will and muſt in this caſe Always neceſſitate him to believe That to be the Doctrine of Chriſt, which he finds confirmed by the joint Teſtimonial Authority of the Antient Writers of the Primitive Church :* That *the want of Recourſe being had by Divines* (pag. 58) *to the ſaid Antient Writers, and of juſt Deference to their Teſtimonies, is a thing very deſtructive of Religion, and the Cauſe of almoſt all diviſions among Chriſtians :* And that *to act* (pag. 65) *without having due regard to the Primitive Writers, is no other than for Men to lean to their Own Underſtanding.*

That *the Antient Writers* (pag. 14) *are of the greateſt* Authority ; That *Men are obliged, at their utmoſt Peril, to have recourſe*

courſe to the Teſtimonies of the foreſaid Antient Writers, as of the Greateſt Authority *for deciding the True Senſe of Scripture*; And that *if the Antient Writers* (pag. 43) *be really of No* Authority, *what need Dr* Clarke *trouble himſelf in the leaſt, whether they were, or were not, of his Opinion?*

Now to all This, I anſwer:

1. Were the Scripture-Revelation of any particular Doctrine, like the Heathen pretended Oracles of old, only *One ſingle obſcure Sentence*; it might indeed with ſome Colour of Reaſon have been alleged, that for the right underſtanding of it, it were neceſſary to depend on Other following Authorities. But the caſe of the Scripture-Revelation, is far otherwiſe. Our *Saviours* own Diſcourſes are here ſet down *at large*, in no leſs than *Four different Goſpels*: The Doctrine his *Diſciples* preached afterwards, is recorded *diſtinctly* more than once, in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*: And the Controverſies that aroſe in their own times, gave occaſion further for very *large and particular Explications* of that whole Doctrine, in their ſeveral *Epiſtles*. There are contained in the New Teſtament *twenty-ſeven ſeveral Books*, written at *different Times* and in *different Places* by *eight ſeveral inſpired Authors*: And the Texts of each Author may, in caſe of difficulty, be compared with *other Texts* of the *ſame Author* in *other parts* of

the *ſame Book*, and with other Texts of the ſame Author in *different Books* written upon other occaſions, and moreover with the Texts of *other inſpired Authors* writing likewiſe upon the ſame Subject. And can it enter into the Heart of any reaſonable Man to imagine, that after all this, any doctrine of importance ſhould not in *ſuch* a revelation, in ſuch *large*, ſuch *explicit*, ſuch *repeated* inſtructions, be made known as *fully*, as *clearly and diſtinctly*, as the Revealer of it intended it ſhould be known at all? The Writings of any *uninſpired Author* are uſually well enough underſtood, by impartial Perſons comparing one place of his Writings with another, and conſidering without prejudice what is the Deſign of the Author in the reſult of the whole: And is the *Scripture alone* ſuch a Book, as, in doctrines of great *importance*, and mentioned in almoſt *every Page* of the Book, nevertheleſs by the moſt diligent Study and by the moſt careful comparing of the ſeveral Texts one with another, and interpreting the figurative expreſſions by the plain ones, cannot at laſt be underſtood without ſome *New Authoritative Explication?* For inſtance: as to the doctrine of the *Trinity* in particular; Are there in the New Teſtiment *more than* 500 *ſeveral Texts*, from whence the True underſtanding of that doctrine is to be fetched; and ſhall not a reaſonable and unprejudiced

prejudiced Man, by carefully comparing together those 500 Texts, be inabled to understand so much of that doctrine, as was intended to be revealed to him in That Book? That is; shall he not understand *so much* of the doctrine, as properly concerns *Religion*; though he understand not the *metaphysical* or *philosophical part*, which was never intended to be revealed? Undeniably, if in such a Case the Scripture could not be sufficiently understood by such diligent Study and Attention, (as you constantly suppose it can not;) it would necessarily follow from This opinion of yours, that the Scripture, (being, even in matters of great importance, more difficult to be understood than any other Book in the World,) ought by all means to be taken from the people, and the more clear and certain Interpretations put in its place: Which is the very Essence of *Popery*. Yes; but (you will say) there was a *Good Reason* why a Supernatural Truth might be revealed but obscurely in Scripture; *viz.* *because Divine Providence may have provided such EXTERNAL HELPS, as Reason (if duly attended to, and its Dictates not over-ruled by Prejudice or the like,) will tell us are Proper and Sufficient to Determine the True Sense of Scripture in the point controverted*; and because *there is a rational EXPEDIENT preserved by the good* pag. 9. pag. 21.

Providence of God, namely by REFERRING the Cauſe to be Decided by the Teſtimony of the Primitive Church. And is not This a fine Circle; to ſuppoſe Providence has in Scripture given us a Revelation of a particular Doctrine in *more than* 500 *Texts*, only in order to *Refer* the Cauſe to be decided by certain following uninſpired Writers? to ſuppoſe that God ſhould appoint *Infallible* Writers, merely to *Refer* a Cauſe to be decided by *Fallible* ones? that is, that the Scripture ſhould be written, not to be *appealed to*, but to be *appealed from*, in matters of Controverſy? Is not the Scripture, in This way of arguing, a fine Rule of Faith; and the Proteſtant Religion built upon a noble Foundation? Suppoſe a *Papiſt* ſhould affirm, (as Thoſe of That Communion have often done,) that *Tranſubſtantiation*, and the obligation of paying *Mediatorial Worſhip to the Bleſſed Virgin and to Saints and Angels*, is very obſcure in Scripture, on Purpoſe that the Cauſe might be *Referred to be decided by the Primitive Fathers of the Church*; Muſt a *Proteſtant* firſt be obliged to peruſe the Writings of all theſe Fathers, before he can return ſuch a perſon an Anſwer? and ſhall it not be ſufficient for him to reply, that he is Sure he finds not theſe things in Scripture, and therefore they are not at all the Commands of God revealed to him in that Book?

Well;

Well; But ſuppoſing the Cauſe *was referred* from *Scripture*, to be decided by the *Fathers*: Are we hereby ever the nearer? Are the *Fathers* more *eaſy to be underſtood*, than the *Scripture?* or do they ſo *certainly and infallibly agree among Themſelves*, as the Books of the inſpired Writers do? Shall *five hundred Texts* not be enough to inform a Man ſufficiently concerning a doctrine of Truth, and ſhall he be able to find it with more Certainty in the *Fathers?* If the *Scripture* cannot be underſtood, unleſs the *Fathers* interpret it to him; who ſhall in the next place interpret to him *That Interpretation?* and who ſhall explain to him the *True Meaning* of the Fathers, and reconcile to him all their *ſeeming* and *real differences?* For, learned Men, (you know,) of *All* opinions, and in *All* Churches, have always claimed to themſelves the Authority of the Fathers: And the Authority of *One Father* has in moſt Controverſies been confidently cited againſt *Himſelf*, and againſt the Authority of *Others in the ſame Age*, and againſt the Authority of *Others in different Ages*. For though, generally ſpeaking, the Meaning of any one Father, in like manner as the Meaning of Scripture itſelf and of all other Books whatſoever, is in the whole intelligible enough to perſons unprejudiced and not engaged in Controverſy; yet to Men concerned in any Diſputes, the

Fathers

Fathers are (when compared together) at leaſt as difficult, (I think, much more difficult) to be underſtood, than Scripture ; and have much more need of ſome *Infallible Judge*, to interpret their Meaning and to reconcile their different manners of Expreſſion. What *Petavius* and other learned Writers, both Popiſh and Proteſtant, have publiſhed upon this Subject ; is a moſt undeniable Demonſtration of This Truth.

2. Nevertheleſs, though I think it thus the moſt evident of all controverted Points, and indeed the Sole Foundation of the Proteſtant Religion, that the *Scripture* is the *Whole and Only Rule of Truth* in matters of divine Revelation ; and that All neceſſary and important Doctrines therein contained, may be well and ſufficiently underſtood, by carefully comparing together the ſeveral Texts that relate to Such Doctrine : Yet, *as* it is neceſſary, in order to ſuch a comparing of Texts, that a Man underſtand the Language wherein the Texts were written, (or elſe that he be well aſſured of the Fidelity of the Tranſlation, *concerning which matter I ſhall have occaſion preſently to add ſomething further :*) And *as*, in order to his rightly underſtanding the particular Phraſes and Idioms of that Language, it is very adviſable that he conſult the Commentaries of Learned Divines, and conſider the Reaſons they offer for and againſt ſuch

and

and ſuch Rendrings of particular Phraſes: *So*, concerning the *Antient Fathers* likewiſe, I agree it to be extremely adviſable, that as Many as have Abilities, ſhould conſult *Them* alſo, and take in all the Aſſiſtance they can from *Their* Writings, by learning from them the Antient Uſe of Phraſes in the Language they wrote in, by finding the Opinions that prevailed in the ſeveral Times and Churches wherein they lived, and by conſidering carefully the Reaſons they allege, why particular Texts were in Their days underſtood in ſuch or ſuch particular Senſes.

3. But now All This, is not (in *propriety* of Speech) aſcribing any *AUTHORITY* to them. There is indeed a Senſe of the word, *Authority*; in which it may rightly be ſaid, that the *Primitive Writers* are of *Great Authority*. The Opinion or Judgment of every *Learned* Man, carries with it *an Authority*; not to oblige Me to be of His opinion becauſe it is *His*, (for This is peculiar to Inſpired Writers only;) but it ought to carry with it ſuch *Weight*, as to oblige me to conſider carefully the Reaſons which moved *Him*, and which He alleges in order to move *Me* likewiſe, to be of That Opinion. Now in like manner as Great *Learning*, ſo Great *Antiquity* alſo carries with it in This Senſe a ſort of *Authority*: Not a Power of obliging any Man

to

to give his Assent implicitly; but only a Power of *so far* influencing a Man's Opinion, as the Author's Skill in his own and the Scripture-language, and his better Knowlege of the Facts which happened near his own Time, compared with what has at the same time been said by Other Writers who had the same Advantages, ought to have its just Weight among Other considerations, in determining the Judgment of a reasonable and unprejudiced Man. But, in your Remarks, *you* either *yourself* use the word, *Authority*, in Another Sense; or, at least, (considering how much, and to how Fatal a purpose, this word has constantly been abused by the Writers of the Romish Church, almost to the Total destruction of Christian Knowledge,) you have by no means been careful to prevent your *unlearned Reader* from being mis-led into a very wrong and most pernicious Sense of the word. For when you affirm, that possibly
pag. 9. *a supernatural Truth may not be so clearly*
pag. 14. *revealed in Scripture*, but *Men are obliged at their utmost peril to have recourse to the Testimonies of the foresaid Antient Writers, as of the* GREATEST AUTHORITY *for deciding the True Sense of Scripture*; and
pag. 18. that *their Testimonies must in reason be acknowledged to be the* Best PROOFS *that Texts are really* Proofs *of what they are*
pag. 21. *brought to prove*; and that *the Cause is*

RE-

REFERRED to be decided by the Testimony of the Primitive Church;——some of which conversed with the Apostles themselves, and so cannot be reasonably supposed but to have INFALLIBLY Known *the True Sense of Scripture, and CONSEQUENTLY to have* Delivered *the same, both in their Own Writings, and to Those with whom they conversed; By which means, those that lived in the THIRD Age may likewise be reasonably supposed to have had opportunity sufficient to know CERTAINLY the true Sense of Scripture, either by perusing the Writings of many such as had conversed with the Apostles themselves or their immediate Successors, or else by* Conversing *with many such as* had Conversed *with the immediate* Successors *of the Apostles:* What is This, but affirming that *Uninspired Writers* which followed after, were, by the Help of I know not what *Tradition*, able to express a doctrine of Christ more *clearly and intelligibly*, more *properly and wisely*, than the *Inspired Writers themselves* were able to do, even in more than 500 Texts that relate to That Doctrine?

4. But after All, let the *Authority* of the Primitive Fathers be what it will, and even as Great as you yourself suppose it; yet it will be nothing at all to *Your* purpose. For though you *confidently affirm*, that I *reject the Catholick Doctrine of the Primitive* pag. 35.

Church; (meaning by the *Primitive Church*, That of the *Three* first Ages, as you expressly declare, *pag.* 13 *and* 21 :) that I
p ag. 41. am *not to be convinced of* my *Errors by the Testimony of the Antient Writers*; that my
pag. 43. *Notions are inconsistent with the Testimonies of the Antient Writers*; that *it necessarily*
pag 45. *follows that* my *Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity is* FALSELY *so called, as being inconsistent with the doctrine of the Trinity received and maintained by the Antient Wri-*
pag.64,65. *ters*; and that *the True Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity, as understood by the Primitive Catholick Church*, is *opposite to* Dr Clarke's *Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity falsely so called*; and always take this for *Granted*, in all your Arguments through your whole Book: Yet the Reader must know, that All This is merely extravagant *Confidence*, without any Foundation and without any Colour of *Truth*. An innocent unlearned Reader indeed, must needs be led to imagine, from your *Manner* of writing, that it was without all question a yielded and uncontroverted point, that every One of the Fathers in the whole Three first Centuries did clearly, unanimously, and in a most constant and uniform manner, contradict *my* Notion and confirm *yours*. But have you, for This, brought any the least Shadow or Appearance of *Proof*? Have you alleged the *Testimonies* of Any of those Primitive

Primitive Fathers? On the contrary, have not *I* cited out of them *Numerous moſt expreſs and poſitive Teſtimonies* in favour of what I advanced? and made it appear by *their own plain and undeniable words*, that they generally interpreted the *Texts* of the New Teſtament in the very ſame manner as I did? Have You, or the Other Perſon you refer to as a Sufficient Anſwerer, offered any thing at all to *invalidate* theſe Citations of mine? or ſo much as attempted to give your Readers Any Reaſon to believe, that Thoſe Fathers underſtood the Texts otherwiſe than I do? Now therefore either theſe Fathers *were conſiſtent Writers*, and entirely agreeing both with Themſelves and with each Other; or they *were not*. If they *were*, (as your Diſcourſe every where ſuppoſes;) then it was incumbent upon you in Juſtice, before you concluded againſt me, to have reconciled All my Citations out of them to your own Notion, and to have ſhown that thoſe Citations did not neceſſarily infer what I deduced from them; (which I am perſwaded the Wit of Man cannot do, and the moſt learned both of Proteſtant and Popiſh Writers have freely acknowleged that 'tis impoſſible to do it:) But if the Fathers *were not* conſiſtent Writers; then, though you *ſhould* allege ſome ſingle paſſages out of them in Favour of *your* Notion, (as I have cited very Many

from them moſt fully expreſſive of *mine*,) yet That will not by any means make good your Aſſertion. That which ſeems to Me the fair Truth of the caſe, (and of which every Reader that has Ability and a Deſire to know the full State of this matter, muſt judge for Himſelf, by peruſing the Books themſelves, and not contenting himſelf with ſeeing ſingle Citations collected only on One ſide,) is This: that the *generality* of the Writers *before* the Council of *Nice*, were in the whole clearly on *my ſide*; though ſome particular paſſages may be picked out of them, which will ſeem to look the contrary way: and that the *generality* of Writers *after* the Time of that Council, were in the main *againſt* me; yet ſo, as that out of *Them*, (eſpecially in their Interpretation of Texts of Scripture relating to this Controverſy,) as many or more paſſages in proportion may be alleged *for* me, than out of the *antienter Writers* can be brought *againſt* me. And if you pleaſe to look into the Learned Dr *Cudworth*'s Intellectual Syſtem, *from pag.* 602, *to pag.* 612, you will find he has largely and undeniably proved, that the Notion the *Nicene Fathers themſelves* profeſſed, was entirely different from and inconſiſtent with Yours: As I ſhall preſently have occaſion to ſhow more particularly. Thus, you ſee, the Reaſon why I allowed not the Primi-

tive

tive Fathers to have properly any *Authority* in matters of Faith, was not (as you moſt unjuſtly and unreaſonably would have your Reader take for granted,) that I knew them to be *againſt* me; but on the contrary, becauſe, though I knew (and *proved* it alſo by Numerous Citations) that they were generally *for* me, yet, in fairneſs of Argument, I reſolved to lay no Streſs upon them, becauſe I would preſerve entire to the *Scripture*, its being the *Whole and Only Rule of Truth* in matters of Revelation: Which is the Sole Foundation, upon which the Proteſtant Religion can poſſibly pretend to be maintained. Where now is the Conſcience and Juſtice of affirming, as you do, *pag.* 24, that *Dr* Clarke *ſuppoſes a Man may, by the external Authority of the Primitive Church, or JOINT TESTIMONY of the Antient Writers of the Firſt Ages, be bound to believe any thing to be the doctrine of Chriſt, which at the ſame time his Beſt Underſtanding neceſſitates him to believe is Not that Doctrine?* When a Man writes in a Heat for what he is pleaſed in his own Fancy to call *Orthodoxy*, is it reaſonable that he ſhould thereby preſently be diſcharged from having any ſober Regard to *Truth and Right?* Yet here again I muſt deſire the Reader always to remember, that this Whole Debate concerning the Opinion of the Fathers, is *beſide the main Queſtion:* And

were

were it as certainly *True*, as it is a manifeſt and notorious *Miſtake*, that the Primitive Fathers were *unanimouſly of Your Opinion*; yet it would avail nothing towards gaining your Point. For, I ſay again, the Scripture Only is, in matters of divine Revelation, the Rule of Truth.

You affirm (*pag.* 16,) that I charge *ſome of the moſt Celebrated Biſhops and even Martyrs of the PRIMITIVE Church*, with *endeavouring to prove ſomething not very conſiſtent with* what they elſewhere aſſert: That I *charge the Governours of the PRIMITIVE Church* (pag. 53, 54, 56,) *with growing Minute in determining Unneceſſary Controverſies, with being Uncharitable in their Cenſures, and with departing from the Fountain of Catholick Unity*: And (*pag.* 40,) that *as the Dr charges THEM with Not always ſpeaking very conſiſtently*; *ſo in the ſame page he charges THEM with frequently going about to affirm, and indeavouring to prove, ſomething not very conſiſtent with what they could not elſewhere forbear expreſſing clearly and diſtinctly*; *and likewiſe he repreſents THEM, as lying under the ſtrongeſt and moſt ſettled Prejudices.* Now This, though of no great moment to the Merits of the Cauſe, yet deſerves to be taken notice of, that your own Conſcience may reprove you for *Careleſsneſs* at leaſt. For,

For, Who (I beſeech you) does that word, *THEM*, refer to? Does it not, in each part of *your* Sentence, mean neceſſarily the *ſame* Perſons? But in *my* Introduction *I* carefully diſtinguiſhed the Writers *before* the Council of *Nice*, (to whom you your ſelf alſo confine the word *Primitive*,) from thoſe who wrote *after* it; And what I ſaid about *Prejudices*, is there expreſsly applied to the *Later Writers only*, in contradiſtinction to the *Earlier* ones: And when I had ſaid, *many Antient Writers expreſſed my Notion clearly and diſtinctly, even FREQUENTLY when at the ſame time they were about to affirm, and indeavouring to prove, ſomething not very conſiſtent with it*; I diſtinctly explained my Meaning after the following manner, in the very next words; *The greateſt part of the Writers* Before *and* At *the time of the Council of* Nice, *were (I think) Really of That Opinion, (though they do not always ſpeak very clearly and conſiſtently,) which I have indeavoured to ſet forth in thoſe Propoſitions*; *But as to the Writers* After *that Time, the Reader muſt not wonder if Many Paſſages not conſiſtent with (nay, perhaps contrary to) thoſe which are here cited, ſhall by Any One be alleged out of the ſame Authors*; *For I do not cite places out of* THESE [theſe Later] *Authors, ſo much to ſhow what was the Opinion of the Writers themſelves, as to ſhow how naturally* pag. 18.

turally Truth ſometimes prevails by its own native clearneſs and evidence, even againſt the ſtrongeſt and moſt ſettled Prejudices; [That is; how Men are frequently compelled to acknowledge ſuch *Premiſes* to be true, as neceſſarily infer a *Concluſion* contrary to what they intend to eſtabliſh.] And what
pag. 7. I ſaid about Mens being *Minute in determining unneceſſary Controverſies*, and *impoſing things much harder to be underſtood than the Scripture itſelf*, and *becoming more uncharitable in their Cenſures*, and *departing from the Fountain of Catholick Unity, the Apoſtolical Form of Sound Words*; was likewiſe plainly meant of thoſe who lived *After* your *primitive* period of Three Centuries; though theſe Corruptions did indeed, in ſome meaſure, *begin ſooner*; (as appears from the Practiſe of *Valentinus*, *Montanus*, *Tertullian* and others;) and This evil Spirit, like all others, grew up *by Degrees*: According to that Prophecy of St. *Paul*, 2 Tim. 4, 4, *The Time will come, when they will not endure ſound Doctrine, but——ſhall turn away their ears from the Truth, and ſhall be turned unto Fables.*

Your Obſervation, (*pag.* 27,) that my affirming *a Man muſt of neceſſity at laſt underſtand with his OWN Underſtanding and not ANOTHERS*, is the ſame in effect as to ſay, that *he muſt of neceſſity at laſt come*

come to a right Understanding of any thing, SOLELY by his OWN Understanding, without the HELP of any OTHERS; is beneath the Gravity of a serious Writer. For though you are pleased to play with the words, and amuse your Reader for two or three pages; yet you well knew, my Meaning was not, that *the Means whereby a Man comes to a right understanding of a thing, is Solely by his Own Understanding, without the Help of any Other's Understanding*; but that, after he has procured from Others all the Help he can, his Judgment must finally be determined by the *Reason of the thing itself*, and not by the *Opinion he has conceived of the Ability or Honesty of the Persons*, the Help of whose Reasons he makes use of. For example: In order to understand rightly the Meaning of any Text or Texts of Scripture, my judgment must finally be determined, not by any Opinion I may have conceived of the *Ability and Honesty of such and such Fathers or Commentators*, (which is what *You* would have, upon a wonderful groundless Imagination of the Fathers being on your side;) but it must be determined by what appears to Me to be *the Signification of the Words themselves*, after I have seriously consider'd the Text, and compared it with other Texts, and with what as many either Antient Fathers, or Modern Commentators, pag. 25.

or Living Teachers have said upon it, as I happen to have Ability and Opportunity of consulting.

But here follows, you think, an unanswerable Argument: *The Original Revelation of the Old Testment*, (you say, *pag.* 27,) *is in the Hebrew and Chaldee Tongues; and the Original Revelation of the New Testament, is in the Greek:* You *ask therefore, What they who know neither Greek nor Hebrew, nor Chaldee, and who make the far greatest part of Christians, must do to know the Sense of Scripture? Are not These under a Necessity of Relying on the Translation made of the original Revelation into their Native Tongue, or else (which comes to the same) on WHATEVER their Particular Teachers shall tell them is the Sense of the Original Revelations?* The same thing you repeat again, *pag.* 28. And the Inference you draw from it, *pag.* 29, is This: As *the divine Providence has and still does raise up Men of Learning enough, to Translate or understand the Original Languages; and of Integrity enough, not wilfully to corrupt or recede from the Sense of the Original Revelation; So, by parity of Reason, notwithstanding the True Sense of Scripture, concerning some most important Points of Religion, is not to be so Clearly known from Scripture itself, as to leave no room for Doubt;*

Doubt; *and the said Doubt is not to be removed by any more Rational Means, than Recourse to the joint Testimonies of the Antient Writers*; *yet it is not reasonably to be denied but God has made suitable Provision for the Salvation of all Men, inasmuch as his Providence has and does still raise up Men of Learning enough to understand the Antient Writers, and of Integrity enough not wilfully to corrupt or recede from their Meaning, or That Sense wherein they understood the Scripture as to the controverted Points of Religion.* 'Tis very wonderful, Sir, a Man of your Abilities should not perceive, that this Argument of yours makes all Religions equal, and consequently supposes that there is no such Thing as True Religion at all. For if *the far greatest part of Christians* (as you affirm,) *—are under a Necessity of Relying——on WHATEVER their Particular Teachers shall tell them is the SENSE of the original Revelations*; Then, since *the joint Testimonies of the Antient Writers* are to determine That Sense; and since all denominations of Christians, whether Popish or Protestant, cannot but think their own *Particular Teachers* (or else they would not follow them) to be *Men of Learning enough to understand the Antient Writers, and of Integrity enough not wilfully to corrupt or recede from their Meaning*; here are plainly all Religions put upon an

pag. 27.

pag. 29.

equal Foot; or rather, That which has the greateſt Numbers on its ſide, will always have the Advantage; or elſe we are of neceſſity gotten into that endleſs Circle, that the *True Church* can only be diſcerned by firſt underſtanding the True Senſe of *Scripture*, and yet that at the ſame time the True Senſe of *Scripture* can only be learnt from the *True Church*. But (thanks be to God,) both the Foundation itſelf of your Argument, and That which you build upon it, are entirely erroneous. No Chriſtians are under a Neceſſity of relying on the Judgment of their Particular Tranſlators, but only thoſe *Blind Followers of the Blind*, who are willing to have both the Original and the Tranſlation alſo taken from them, that they may ſecurely walk after their Teachers *into the Ditch*. All Others look upon it to be not only Lawful, but their Duty alſo, to ſee as much as poſſible with their own Eyes. And very Much of this is poſſible, even to mean Capacities, who are ſincerely deſirous not to be deceived. They can read or hear the Whole Scripture, and compare one part of it with another, and interpret the figurative expreſſions by the plain ones, and obſerve how Men of different Opinions underſtand words; and can collect their Duty, not from ſingle controverted Texts, but from thoſe numerous plain and often-repeated inſtructions, in

which

which the generality of Learned Men ſufficiently agree both as to the Tranſlation and the Senſe. For, as the Truth and Uncorruptneſs of the *original Text it ſelf* is made known to Chriſtians, not by the *Authority* of their Particular Teachers, but by the Teſtimony of *Friends and Enemies*, Men *of All opinions* in All Ages from the Beginning, whoſe *different Intereſts and Opinions* made it impoſſible for them to agree either in deceiving or being deceived; (which is the Greateſt Evidence a *Matter of Fact* is capable of;) and This extends to the *whole Text*, excepting only a Very few *various Readings* of any Importance, concerning which all capable perſons are ſtill at liberty to judge: So the Truth and Goodneſs of any *Tranſlation*, is made known to thoſe who uſe it, not by the *Authority* of their Particular Teachers, but by its having been examined and compared by Men of *different Opinions*, whoſe Intereſt has engaged them to diſcover Faults where there are any; By which means, a Tranſlation, in a Free Country, cannot but be in the main agreeable to the Original; and where it is ſo controverted in any particular paſſage, as that the Reaſons for *different Rendrings* ſeem on Both ſides equal, it is There not only lawful, but Mens Duty to look upon the Tranſlation as of *no ſufficient Authority*, if they have any regard to Truth in the

matter

matter of their Religion. But ſuppoſing it *were* True, as it is a great Miſtake, that Men muſt needs truſt their Particular Teachers for the *Truth of a Tranſlation*; that is, for the Truth of the *Matter of Fact*, that This or That *is* the Text of Scripture; would it from thence follow, that they muſt likewiſe as blindly truſt them for the *Senſe and Meaning* of the words; that is, in a matter, not of *Fact*, but of *Judgment*? Suppoſing it *were* neceſſary, that the Authority of particular Men muſt be truſted *in ſome Reſpects*, becauſe (ſuppoſe) in thoſe particular reſpects there was no other poſſible means of knowlege, and Men can do no more towards informing themſelves than is poſſible for them to do; would it therefore follow that they muſt truſt likewiſe *in Other Reſpects*, where there is No ſuch neceſſity? And muſt *They* alſo who *do* underſtand Languages, truſt entirely to the Ability and Fidelity of *Others*, as well as They who do *not* underſtand them? Verily, Sir, according to *your* Scheme of Divinity, no poſſible reaſon can be given, why it would not be much better to take the Scriptures quite away from the people; and not from the people only, but from the greateſt part even of the Learned alſo. For if the *Scripture* (how plain ſoever the Words themſelves may happen to be) muſt of neceſſity be underſtood to mean

neither

neither more nor leſs than what the *Fathers* ſay it means; and the *Fathers* (how plain ſoever Their words alſo may happen to be) muſt of neceſſity be underſtood to mean neither more nor leſs than what the Particular Teachers of every Church ſay they mean; 'tis evident there can be no other Uſe of publiſhing the *Scripture* (nay, and the *Fathers* too) to the World, but only to diſturb this happy Tranquillity, and give Occaſion for Men, by judging for themſelves, to run the hazard of differing ſometimes from one another in opinion.

But you proceed, (*pag.* 30) and ask; *Upon what grounds does* Dr Clarke *believe the ſeveral Books of the Old or New Teſtament to have been written by thoſe Inſpired Writers, to whom they are aſcribed? Is it not, becauſe they have been Believed ſo to be by Other Chriſtians, through the ſeveral Ages of Chriſtianity up to the Firſt Age, wherein they were Known to be ſuch by the Chriſtians then Living? And if* Dr Clarke's *Belief of the Books of the Bible to be the Inſpired Revelation of God, is thus founded on the Belief of Others; I would fain know why his Belief of Any Article of Religion* CONTAINED IN THE SAID INSPIRED REVELATION, *may not likewiſe be founded on the Belief of Others; namely as a Ground of his own Belief; as a*

good

good Ground, that What he believes, he believes in the True Sense of Scripture, because he believes it in That Sense, wherein it has been believed through the several Ages of Christianity up to the First, wherein it was known to be the True Sense of Scripture. To the *first* part of this your Question, I answer: I believe the Books of Scripture to have been written by those Inspired Writers whose Names they bear, not upon the Authority of any Particular Teachers, but upon the agreeing Evidence of *Friends* and *Enemies* of all Sorts, of Christians of *different Opinions*, and of *Jews* and *Heathens*; the Books having been cited by innumerable opposite Writers in all Ages and in different Languages, and dispersed both in the Original and in numerous agreeing Translations through all Countries, from the Beginning. And this is the *proper* Evidence of a *Matter of Fact*. But now as to the *Sense and Meaning*, of Words agreed to be the genuine Text; (which is a Question, not of *Fact*, but of *Judgment*;) this is to be determined, not by *Tradition*, but by *Reason and good Understanding*. And, if it *was* to be determined by *Tradition*; yet for you in the present case to pretend (contrary to the full Evidence of all History extant in the World) that there is as universal a Tradition for the Texts of Scripture having been from the Beginning interpreted

terpreted according to Your Notion, as there is for the Books of Scripture having been written by Thoſe whoſe Names they bear; is to pretend that the Darkneſs of Midnight, is equal in Brightneſs to the Sun ſhining at Noon-day. To the *ſecond* part of your Queſtion, I anſwer: that my *Belief of any Article of Religion* CONTAINED IN THE SAID INSPIRED REVELATION, is not *founded on the Belief of Others*, namely on Their believing it *to be the True Senſe of Scripture*; but it is founded wholly upon my Seeing it to be (what in your Queſtion you ſuppoſe it Is,) CONTAINED IN THE SAID INSPIRED REVELATION. pag. 31.

But you go on; *pag.* 32. *Though the words*, Biſhop *and* Presbyter, *for inſtance, are uſed promiſcuouſly in Scripture, yet ſurely* Dr Clarke *will not ſay, that I confound and blend the Antient Writers with Scripture, becauſe I look on Their Teſtimonies as a Deciſive Proof, that there were notwithſtanding Three Diſtinct Orders of the Miniſtry in the Time of the Apoſtles.* I readily acknowledge that the Teſtimonies of Antient Writers, when they agree, and ſo far as they agree, are a juſt and Deciſive Proof of any Queſtion of *Fact* relating to their own Times: But how This tends to prove, (what you would

would have,) that any Man can be obliged by the Opinion of Others, to believe any *Text of Scripture* to *mean*, what he himself cannot with the utmost Care perceive the words of That Text to *signify*; this I understand not.

ibid. You add; *In like manner, although the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are said* (1 Joh. 5, 7,) *to be only* One, *not explicitly* One God, *or of the same Divine Individual Essence; yet it will not follow——that I confound and blend the* Antient Writers *with Scripture; because I look upon* Their Testimonies *to be a sufficient Proof and Authority for believing Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be truly and properly* One God, *or of the same Divine Individual Essence; or that This is the* True Sense *wherein* St John *understood them to be One.* Now by your manner of citing this Text here, and again *pag.* 59; would not any unlearned Reader, depending upon your fidelity, be led to imagine, that without Doubt this Text was unanimously understood in your Sense by *all the Primitive Fathers?* Whereas in Truth on the contrary, besides that the whole Text is wanting in all the *Antient Versions* in all Languages, and does not with any certainty appear to have ever been found so much as in *any One* Manuscript Copy of the *original Greek*, that Is

or

or ever Was in the World, but seems rather to have been first added in the Greek even after the Invention of Printing, (as you will find reason to think, if you consider carefully what *Erasmus* has said upon this Subject, and Dr *Mills* in his Dissertation on the Text, *compared* with his remarkable acknowledgment upon better information and second Thoughts, in his *Prolegomena*, † *pag.* 117, how he himself and the Writers before him had been *DECEIVED* in the

† Optandum omnino foret,— ut indicasset [*Rob. Stephanus*] de Codice quolibet, —integer fuerit, an imperfectus & mutilus; totumne N. T. contineret, an partem duntaxat; fueritne Evangeliorum, an Epistolarum &c. Absque hujusmodi aliquali notitiâ, perit maxima pars beneficii, quod ex MSS &c. Ne dicam, quod laxior iste & indefinitus de Codicibus sermo, trahat in falsa, uti forte fit, de S. Textu judicia. Quum *quindecim* Exemplarium meminerit *Robertus*, quis non statim eum totidem *integros* N. T. Codices nactum arbitraretur? Proclivis hic error; & in quem nemo, qui variantes lectiones ad Editionis *Roberti* tertiæ marginem interiorem positas non diligenter admodum & ex professo expenderit, non facillimè labatur. Hoc certè errore irretiti haud pauci, cùm in celebri illo *S. Joannis* loco de triplici testimonio *Patris*, *Verbi & S. Spiritûs*, 1 Joh. 5, 7, *septem* duntaxat videant Exemplaria, in quibus omissum sit illud, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ intrepidè statim concludunt reliqua *octo* textum illum integrum, nullâque sui parte detruncatum repræsentare; cùm tamen istorum Codicum varietates ad marginem collocatas sedulò per N. T. expendenti constet, e *quindecim* codicibus *Stephanicis* non nisi *septem*, ad marginem istius loci notatos, *epistolam hanc Joannis* exhibere; reliquos omnes vel Evangeliorum esse, vel aliarum saltem N. T. partium. Quin haud semel cùm *Amelotius*, aliique, tùm & *Nos ipsi*, in hâc palæstrâ diutiùs paullò versati licet, examine Codicum istorum per omnes N. T. libros ex varietatibus haud dum facto, in eundem errorem incidimus.

the matter of *Stephens*'s Manuſcripts:) it has moreover never been cited by *Athanaſius* or any of the numerous Writers in the whole *Arian* Controverſy; nor mentioned in the genuine Works of any *Greek Father* at all, either *before* the Council of *Nice*, or *after* it; though many of them quote the words

---

That is: *It were to be wiſhed, that* Stephens *had diſtinguiſhed concerning every Manuſcript, whether it was entire or imperfect, whether it contained the Whole New Teſtament or Part only, whether it was a Copy of the Goſpels or Epiſtles. Without thus diſtinguiſhing, the Copies loſe the greateſt part of their Uſe: Not to ſay, that for want of ſuch diſtinction, Men are often led into an erroneous Judgment concerning the Sacred Text. For inſtance: When* Stephens *mentions* fifteen *Copies, Who would not preſently imagine that he meant ſo many* Entire *Copies of the New Teſtament? 'Tis a very natural Error; and which any one may eaſily fall into, if he does not carefully and with that very View conſider the various Readings marked in the inner margin of his third Edition. 'Tis by This Miſtake, that in That famous paſſage of* St John, *concerning the* threefold Teſtimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, 1 Joh. 5, 7; *many perſons, when they obſerve the words,* in Heaven, [He ſhould here rather have ſaid, *the whole 7th verſe,* and the words, *on Earth,* in the 8th verſe, as appears by comparing together the ſeveral parts of his Diſſertation,] *to be wanting in* on'y Seven *of* Stephens's *Manuſcripts; preſently conclude, that, without doubt, the* other Eight *have That Text entire and perfect: Whereas in Truth, he that carefully obſerves the various Readings of Thoſe Manuſcripts, marked in the Margin through the Whole New Teſtament; will find that, out of* Stephens's fifteen *Copies, thoſe* ſeven only, *which are referred to at the margin of This Text, have* this Epiſtle of St John at all; *all the reſt, being Copies of the* Goſpels *only, or of other parts of the New Teſtament. Into this Errour, not only* Amelot *and Other Writers, but* I myſelf *alſo, though long employed in this very Study, had more than once fallen, before I had examined all the Copies by their various Readings through all the Books of the Whole New Teſtament.* Mills Prolegomena, *pag.* 117.

immedi-

immediately foregoing and following: Neither is it alleged by any *Latin Father* before *St Jerom*, excepting only (as Some think) in one paſſage of *Tertullian*, and in one of *Cyprian:* And of thoſe Two paſſages, That of *Tertullian* is plainly not a citation of this Text, but the words of the Author himſelf; And that the Other of *Cyprian*, (if genuine, as I ſee no reaſon to doubt,) is only a myſtical Interpretation of the following 8*th* Verſe, and not a citation of the 7*th*, is more than probable, as well from the Teſtimony of *Eucherius* and the expreſs Evidence of *Facundus* referred to by Dr *Mills*, as from the Text's being wanting in all even the Latin Copies both before and long after *Cyprian*'s time. And even in the firſt *Engliſh* Bibles after the Reformation, in the Time of *Henry the* 8*th* and *Edward the* 6*th*, it was printed in a *different Character*, to ſignify its being wanting in the Original: Which Diſtinction came afterwards to be neglected. And the Senſe of the Apoſtle is very complete *without* this Text, according to the following Reading of All the Greek Manuſcripts and Antient Verſions: *Who is he that overcometh the World, but he that believeth that Jeſus is the Son of God? This is he that came* [that was declared and manifeſted to be the Son of God,] *by Water* [at his Baptiſm, when there came a Voice

Voice from Heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son;] *and* (by) *Blood*, [viz. by his Death and Resurrection:]——*And it is the Spirit* [the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the Power of Miracles granted to the Apostles,] *that beareth witness*; *because the Spirit is Truth: For there are Three that bear Record, the Spirit and the Water and the Blood*; *and these Three agree in One*, [or, as some Antient Writers read the Text, *these Three Are One*,] viz. *One Testimony*, that Jesus is the Son of God. These things ought not, in justice and fairness, to be concealed from the World, by so citing the Text in a point of controversy, as if there *never* had been *any controversy* about it, and as if *all Primitive Writers* (who indeed never cite it at all) had agreed with you, both in the citation and in the interpretation of the words. You ought *at least* to have acknowledged the *dubiousness* of the Text. And if the Text had been unquestionably genuine, yet you do not use the English Reader well, when you affirm that *though* the Three Persons *are said* (1 Joh. 5, 7,) *to be only* One, *and not explicitly* One God, *yet &c.* For though the English word, (*One*,) is indeed ambiguous, and may signify *One God*, or *One Person*, or *One Nature*, or *One Essence*; yet the Greek word, (ἕν,) is not so, and cannot possibly signify any of these things

things, unleſs by a remote and figurative conſtruction.

However, in your Interpretation of this Text, you declare explicitly what *your Notion* of the Trinity is. And ſtill more diſtinctly, *pag.* 21; *The Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity* (you ſay) *is truly This, that in the Godhead there are Three Perſons of the ſame Divine INDIVIDUAL Eſſence.* Now This, I ſay, is an expreſs Contradiction in the very Terms. For *INDIVIDUAL Eſſence*, in all propriety of Speech, and if the word has any Signification at all, is (when ſpoken of an *Intelligent* Being) the very ſame as *PERSONAL Eſſence*; that is to ſay, That by which a Perſon is that Individual Perſon which he is, and no Other. Beſides, it is a Phraſe not only not uſed in *Scripture*, nor in the *Three Firſt Centuries*, nor in the *Fourth*, (unleſs it be the True Rendring of the word μονούσιος or ταυτούσιος, which was then univerſally condemned as *Heretical*;) but ſeems to be the Invention of the Schools, in latter Ages. Hear the very learned Dr *Cudworth* upon This Point. *It is evident*, (ſaith he, pag. 604.) *that theſe reputed Orthodox Fathers*, [viz. St Cyril, St Gregory Nyſſen, and others,] *who were not a Few, were far from thinking the Three Hypoſtaſes of the Trinity to have the ſame SIN-*

SINGULAR existent Essence:——That Trinity of Persons numerically the same, or having all one and the same SINGULAR existent Essence, is a Doctrine which seemeth Not to have been owned by Any publick Authority in the Christian Church, save that of the Lateran *Council only: That no such thing was ever entertained by the* Ni-
pag. 605. cene *Fathers, &c.* Again: *The Truth of This* (saith he) *will appear, first, because these Orthodox Anti-Arian Fathers did all of them zealously condemn* Sabellianism; *the doctrine whereof is no other than this, that there was but One Hypostasis, or Singular INDIVIDUAL ESSENCE, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost:* In the
ibid. next place, because *the word Homoousios, was never used by Greek Writers otherwise, than to signify the Agreement of things NUMERICALLY DIFFERING from*
pag. 611. *one another, &c.——Lastly, that the Antient Orthodox Fathers, who used the word Homoousios against Arius, intended not therein to assert the Son to have One and the same Singular or INDIVIDUAL Essence with the Father, appeareth plainly from their disclaiming and disowning those Two words,*
ibid. Ταυτόσπον *and* Μο οὐσιον. Again: *It is plain* (says he) *that the Antient Orthodox Fathers asserted No such thing, as One and the Same SINGULAR or Numerical Essence of the several Persons of the Trinity.* And This

This he proves by numerous moſt expreſs Quotations. Where now is your vain Confidence in the *Concurrent Teſtimonies of the Fathers*; when not only in the *Three Firſt Centuries* your Notion, in the manner you expreſs it, was never heard of, but even in the *Fourth* and following Centuries it was univerſally condemned? But ſtill I am willing to allow all This to be beſides the main Queſtion; For *Scripture only* is *Our Rule.*

Well: *But Dr Clarke* (you ſay) *can't but know, that the moſt uſual Pleas made by Presbyterians, Anabaptiſts, and other Sectaries, are no other than what He himſelf urges,* viz. *that Scripture is the only Rule of Truth in matters of Religion,* and *that Men are to take care not to confound and blend Human Teſtimonies with Scripture.* Very True: Presbyterians and Other Sectaries receive the Holy Scripture as *their* Rule: What Then? Muſt *We* therefore *not receive* it as *our* Rule? Presbyterians and Other Sectaries pretend to follow *Scripture only:* Muſt *We* therefore *not pretend* to follow *Scripture only?* Surely, Sir, the Queſtion is not, who they are that *pretend* to make Scripture their Guide, but who they are that *really* make it ſo. And though Men of *all opinions* do indeed allege Scripture for their opinions, yet I think there is plainly This difpag. 32.

ference : In favour of *Some opinions* there can be alleged only ſome very Few, and thoſe very Obſcure and controverted Texts, and ſuch as can be demonſtrated not to prove what they are alleged for, by numerous plain and clear Texts evidently evincing the contrary : On the other ſide, in favour of *ſome Other opinions*, there can be alleged a very great Number of plain and clear Texts, even the whole Tenour and Deſign of Scripture ; againſt which on the contrary there can be oppoſed by an Adverſary, only ſome Single obſcure and very diſputable Texts. The Inference I would draw from hence is, that every Opinion concerning a Point of Revealed Religion, ought to be look'd upon as having juſt ſo much more or leſs Certainty, and to be treated accordingly, in proportion as it is built either upon *More* and *Plainer*, or upon *Fewer* and *Obſcurer* Texts. Well : But Who ſhall be *Judge*, whether an Opinion is built upon *Many and Clear*, or upon *Few and Obſcure* Texts ? I anſwer : As *Wiſdom* is juſtified of all her Children, ſo *Truth* alſo muſt finally be left to be juſtified by the *Reaſon of Mankind* ; And whoſoever ſtudies the Scripture with a ſincere and unprejudiced Deſire of finding the Truth, in order to *obey the Will of God* ; has the Promiſe of our Lord, that he *ſhall know of the Doctrine whether it be of God.* But *you* are

of

of another Opinion, and think ſome *Other Judge* neceſſary: I heartily wiſh, it were an *Infallible One.* You think the Cauſe is referred to be *Decided by the Primitive Fathers:* But Men of *all opinions* allege *Fathers* alſo, as well as Scripture; And ſo the Queſtion returns, Who ſhall *interpret* to us *the Fathers?* Your Anſwer at laſt muſt be, *The Church.* And then, (you know the Queſtion has often been put in the Romiſh controverſy,) *Who* is the *Church?* The *Church of Rome* pretends to it; The *Greek Church* pretends to it; and *the Church in every other Nation upon Earth* pretends to it; The *preſent Church* pretends to it; and the *Church that was* 500 *Years ſince,* full of very different Opinions, pretended to it likewiſe: And *Who* ſhall judge, which of Theſe is in the Right? Of neceſſity it muſt end in *This* at laſt: Either the Church muſt be judged by the Scripture, and Men by ſtudying the Scripture muſt find which Church it is ſafeſt for them to joyn with; (Which Principle is the Foundation and Eſſence of Proteſtant Religion;) Or elſe *every Man* muſt *blindly* follow the *Authority* of the firſt *Teachers* he happens upon; Which Opinion of yours, is fairly putting an end to all Religion at once, and terminates at length in Mr *Hobbs*'s doctrine, That the *ſtrongeſt Arm* ought always to put an end to all *Differences of Opinion,* juſt as

Darkneſs puts an end to all *Differences of Colour*. Beſides: If the *Church* muſt *interpret* the *Fathers interpretation* of Scripture; ſtill the Queſtion returns, *Who* ſhall *interpret* That laſt *interpretation* of the Church? For, you well know, All the *Confeſſions of Faith* that ever were publiſhed by Humane Authority, have occaſioned more Contentions, and been more difficult to *explain*, than the *Scripture itſelf*. Which is not at all to be wondred at. For, as, in *Philoſophical Queſtions*, the *Commentators and Interpreters* of *Ariſtotle*, intermixing inſenſibly their own opinions with His, are infinitely harder to be underſtood, than the Works of *Ariſtotle* himſelf; ſo all *Syſtems of Divinity*, containing in them both the Whole Doctrine of Scripture and moreover a mixture of humane Opinions, muſt of neceſſity be more liable to be diſputed about, than the *Scripture itſelf*. (For which reaſon, in explaining the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; [*and the ſame Method would be very uſeful in all other Points of Divinity*;] I have indeavoured to ſet forth the whole Doctrine in the very words of the Scripture itſelf, by collecting and placing in one view All the Texts that relate to that Subject; that the Reader may diſtinguiſh, at firſt Sight, what is *indiſputably* revealed to him by divine Authority, from what is only propoſed to him as *humane opinion*, which

may

may always be disputed about, and ought perpetually to be examined with Care.) What a *Wilderness* now are you got into? And where will you stop, when once you depart from Scripture the Only Rule of revealed Truth; and use any Humane Writings, not as *Assistances to help you to understand*, but as *authoritatively Decisive of*, the Meaning of Scripture? The plain Truth of the whole Matter, I think, is This: As all other Books are generally well enough understood, by reasonable Men who study them with That Design; so the plain and necessary Parts of Scripture, the Rules by which Men shall be judged at the last day, are easy to be understood even by mean capacities; and those which are really obscure, as it is not possible Men should in truth agree about them, so 'tis of no Use they should be forced to pretend it. And yet indeed even the Obscurer passages of Scripture, if Men could be wholly unprejudiced, would not perhaps be so liable to be misunderstood, as is commonly imagined. For consider what is the Reason, that when our Saviour says, *I am the Door*, *I am the Vine*, and the like; no Man, either learned or unlearned, ever misunderstood him: but when he says, *This is my Body*, (which in itself is no harder a Figure, than the other expressions;) about the Meaning of This, Learned Men are perpetually cutting each

others

others Throats. In like manner; What is the true Reaſon, that when *St Paul* ſaith concerning *Himſelf* and *Apollos*, *He that planteth, and he that watereth, are One*, 1 Cor. 3, 8; no Man, either learned or unlearned, ever miſunderſtood him: but when our Saviour ſaith, *I and my Father are One*, (which are the Very Same Words;) he muſt needs be underſtood to mean ſomething utterly unintelligible? And that, when he prays to his Father in behalf of his Diſciples in theſe words; *that They may be One, even as We are One; I in Them, and Thou in Me*; the *former* part of *Each* of theſe Expreſſions is underſtood by every Man, but the meaning of the *latter* part of *each* of them muſt be quarrelled about for ever?

Joh. 10, 30.

Joh. 17, 22 & 23.

You affirm (*pag.* 36,) that I *reject the Sound Judgment of* my *own Mother-Church*; and (*pag.* 37,) that I *ſtand Condemned by the Judgment of the Whole Church of England*. Now though This Accuſation is nothing to the Merits of any Queſtion concerning *Truth* and *Errour*, yet, to obviate the Calumnies of Men who are more concerned about *Other Arguments* than thoſe of *Truth*, I demonſtrated, in my Book, by an Induction of Particulars, that there are *More* paſſages in the Liturgy of the Church of England, from which (taking Them as Premiſes)

Premiſes) my Concluſion will by juſt Reaſoning neceſſarily be inferred, than there are Paſſages which ſeem on the contrary to contradict me. And from hence it follows, that till *You* can reconcile *All* thoſe paſſages I cited, (as you have not attempted to reconcile *Any* of them,) to *Your* Notion; *I* have juſter reaſon to affirm, that *You* ſtand condemned by the Judgment of the Church of England, than *You* have to affirm that *I* do ſo. But the *Argument* by which you prove, that I ſtand condemned by the Judgment of the Church of England; is a very *pleaſant* and *round* One. *By rejecting* (you ſay) *the Catholick Doctrine of the Primitive Church, I reject the Sound Judgment of* my *own Mother-Church.* For the making good of which Argument; firſt, you *ſuppoſe* that my Notion is univerſally condemned by the Writers of the Three Firſt Centuries: But of This, not one Syllable of *Proof*; becauſe the Contrary is True. Well; but *ſuppoſing* my Notion not to agree with the Doctrine of Thoſe Primitive Fathers, how does it *Thence* follow that I am condemned by the Church of England? Why, *becauſe our Prudent as well as Pious Mother would have All her Children——to look on the Teſtimonies of the Antient Writers,* [thoſe of *the Three firſt Ages*, ſo you expreſsly explain yourſelf, *pag.* 21 and throughout,]——*as the Beſt Means to be Rationally*

pag. 36.

pag. 34.

Rationally perſwaded, what may or may not be Truly concluded and proved by Scripture. (It ſeems, without the Fathers, the Scripture is of no Uſe at all to *conclude* or *prove* any thing.) But how do you prove This to be the Judgment of the Church of *England?* Why, *This is evident* (you ſay) *from the PRACTISE of our Church; INASMUCH AS, in the Preface to the Forms of Ordination and Conſecration, our Church has obſerved, as an unanſwerable Proof in itſelf of the Threefold Order of the Miniſtry, that* "*it is evident unto all Men diligently* "*reading*, if not *the Holy Scripture* alone, "yet it *and Antient Authors, that from the* "*Apoſtles time there have been theſe Orders* "*of Miniſters in Chriſt's Church, Biſhops,* "*Prieſts, and Deacons*". *In like manner, by inſerting into her moſt excellent Liturgy, the Nicene OR Conſtantinopolitan Creed, and That commonly called the Creed of St Athanaſius, &c.* That is to ſay: Notwithſtanding the Church has declared in the moſt Solemn and Authentick manner, that *Holy Scripture containeth all things neceſſary to Salvation; ſo that whatſoever is not read therein, or may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any Man, that it ſhould be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation:* And *that it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to Gods word*

pag. 35.

Article 6th.

Article 20th.

word written; *neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another*; *Wherefore although the Church be a Witness and a* KEEPER *of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing* AGAINST *the same, so* BESIDES *the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation:* And that even *General Councils, forasmuch as they be an Assembly of Men whereof All be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining unto God*; *Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to Salvation, have neither Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture:* Notwithstanding all these solemn and most Authentick Declarations; yet, because it *Once* accidentally mentions *Antient Writers*, by way of confirmation of a *matter of Fact*; and inserts into the Liturgy One Creed made in the *Fourth Century*, and Another made *No body knows how many Centuries after That*; (not out of any Regard to the Authority of the Compilers; but merely for This Reason, that the Reformers judged they could retain them agreeably with Scripture, as is expressly declared in the 8*th Article* compared with the 21*st*;) hence you conclude, that *the Church of England would have all her Children* believe, that *the Best Means* *Article 21st.* *pag. 31.*

to be Rationally perſwaded what May or may not be Truly concluded and proved by Scripture, is, not to rely on *the Scripture itſelf*, by ſtudying it and comparing one place with another, but to depend on *the Teſtimonies of the Antient Writers*; and that, unleſs a Man thus makes the Fathers to be his *Rule* of trying the Senſe of Scripture, (that is, unleſs, diametrically oppoſite to the whole *Proteſtant* doctrine, he profeſſes to regard the Scripture ſo far only as it agrees with the Antient Fathers, inſtead of regarding the Antient Fathers ſo far only as they agree with Scripture,) *he ſtands condemned by the Judgment of the Church of England.* Is this the Arguing, of a Man accuſtomed to Mathematical Studies? But beſides: The *Antient Writers*, with you, are the Writers of *the Three firſt Centuries*: And how does the Church of England, by in-
pag. 21. ſerting One Creed made in the *Fourth Century*, and Another made *at leaſt Three or Four Centuries after That*, refer matters of Faith to be decided by the Teſtimony of the Writers in the *Three firſt Centuries?* I am much afraid, if we muſt be *referred* away from the Scripture at all, and if there be any Force in *your* Argument, we ſhall ſoon be *referred* to the Writers of the 8*th and* 9*th Centuries*, as well as of the *Three Firſt*: And then the Proteſtant Cauſe is in a Hopeful Condition.

You

You despise my manner of expressing myself, when I say, *The greatest part of the Writers Before and At the time of the Council of Nice, were, I THINK, Really of That Opinion &c.* But do you imagine, Sir, I thought myself the less *Certain* of what I affirmed, because I did not express it in *Confident Words?* Does *Confidence* ever add *Strength* to any Cause, or give *Weight and Solidity* to any Argument? *I* said, I *Thought* the greatest part of those Writers were on my side; and I gave my *Reasons why* I thought so, in the numerous Citations which I alleged of their own express words. *You*, on the contrary, are very *confident*, that they are All clearly and unanimously against me; but you do not so much as *attempt* to bring any the least *Proof* of what you are so sure of. And do you think that in *This* you have gained any Advantage over me? But concerning the Opinions of the *Fathers*, I have spoken more fully above. *pag.* 43 & 40.

Your whole Argument, *pag.* 49, 50, 51, 52; also *pag.* 21, and indeed in most other parts of your Book; is what may, almost word for word, be retorted upon you in its full strength, by Those of the Church of *Rome*, in favour of *Any* Tradition. The *Scripture* (it seems) is, in many things, *obscure*: *pag.* 9 & 29.

obſcure : The Cauſe muſt be left to be *De-*
pag. 21. *cided by the Teſtimony of the Primitive Church:* Thoſe of the *Firſt* Age, *knew IN-FALLIBLY the True Senſe of Scripture,*
pag. 21. and *CONSEQUENTLY delivered the Same* Truly to their Followers : Thoſe of the *Third* Age, *knew* from thoſe of the
pag. 21. Firſt and Second, *the True Senſe of Scripture CERTAINLY*; and, to be ſure, *made due Uſe of it*, in conveying it Truly
pag. 22. to the next Age ; and ſo On : *The Governours of the Church*, to prevent Errors, muſt
pag. 49. *inſert into the Creed more particular Explanations of ſome Articles :* This, is not *In-*
pag. 50. *larging* the Creed, but *only Expreſſing the Article in More Words* ; the *Senſe* of the *inlarged Creed* being *No other*, than that of
pag. 51. the *original Baptiſmal Creed : Controverted Articles* were Always *explained according to That Senſe, which was derived from the Beginning :* The Providence of God would not permit, that Thoſe who had the *Power,*
pag. 51. ſhould ever not be in the *Right : Governours* therefore never were *uncharitable* in ſuch *Cenſures or Proceedings*, as were *the moſt proper Method to reclaim Heterodox per-*
pag. 52. *ſons :* And thus *the True Senſe of Scripture* has been *preſerved and maintained* by Tradition, and *received by the Catholick Church through the ſeveral ſubſequent Ages thereof*, without Any corruption, even unto This day.

day. Thus argues a *Roman-Catholick:* And if *You* argue *rightly*, ſo alſo does *He :* For One *Egg* is not more like Another, than *His* Argument is like to *Yours*. And in Neither of them indeed is there any Other Fault, but This only, that (God knows) the direct Contrary is in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory too apparently True. The further you go from the *Fountain*, the leſs pure is the *Stream* ; and there is no depending upon any thing but *Scripture*.

Your Obſervation, (*pag.* 50,) that though *every Age grew more Minute*, yet *it was by no means in determining UNNECESSARY Controverſies*, *unleſs* Dr Clarke *will have the determining of the True Senſe of Articles which he allows to be NECESSARY to be underſtood*, *to be the determining of UNNECESSARY Controverſies :* is a mean Playing with words, unbecoming your own Gravity and the Dignity of the Subject. For can any thing be more obvious, than that an *Article* may itſelf be *Neceſſary* to be underſtood, and yet at the ſame time many *Unneceſſary* Controverſies may be raiſed about Circumſtances relating to *That Article ?* Are not the *Reſurrection of the Body*, and the *Life everlaſting*, Two Articles very *neceſſary* to be underſtood by every Chriſtian ? and yet is it not at the ſame time

time a very *unneceſſary* Controverſy, to diſpute whether *every individual particle of the ſame Body that died ſhall be raiſed again*, or not; and whether, in the *Life everlaſting*, the Bleſſed ſhall be capable of *ſtill further Degrees of improvement*, or not? With numberleſs other the like Queſtions. Thus likewiſe, *the Incarnation of the Son of God*, is an Article very *neceſſary* to be underſtood by Chriſtians; and yet to inquire *in what particular metaphyſical manner That Son was begotten of his Father*, may be, and is, a very *unneceſſary* Controverſy.

What follows, (*pag.* 53,) is ſtill much worſe: *LATITUDINARIAN, aliàs COMPREHENSION, aliàs MODERATION-Principles.* What *Science* Theſe *Terms of Art* belong to; and how *well* This *Language* becomes the Mouth of a Serious Divine; and what *Proof* theſe fine Expreſſions amount to, of any part of the Queſtion between us; I ſhall wholly leave to *Others* to judge.

Only one thing I muſt obſerve to you by the by. It is a very *uſual*, but very *unrighteous* cuſtom among Writers of Controverſy, when they can't anſwer *Arguments* in *particular*, to throw *General Names of Reproach*, of No certain determinate Signification. Thus *Mr Chillingworth*, and *Arch-*

Arch-Biſhop Tillotſon, and ſome others of the *Ableſt* and the *Beſt* Men, that the *Proteſtant* and the *Chriſtian* Cauſe was ever defended by; when they could not be *anſwered*, were called *Latitudinarians*; only to raiſe an Odium againſt them among the ignorant people, who cannot eaſily diſtinguiſh between *hard Words* and *hard Arguments*, and are too apt to be prejudiced with *hard Words* whoſe *Meaning* they underſtand not. I am very ſure, that Theſe *Latitudinarians*, whom both *you* and *I* have upon this occaſion mentioned by *Name*, are *pag.* 38. Men that ſincerely indeavoured to follow the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; And though *you Now* ſeem aſhamed to be joined with ſuch Company, yet God grant *I* may be found with them *at the Great Day.*

What you add in the ſame Paragraph, *pag.* 53. as an *Inſtance* of *Latitudinarian* Principles, [*viz.* that *Whoſoever does but profeſs He believes the Original Baptiſmal Creed according to the bare* Words *thereof, no matter in what* Senſe, *He ought to be look'd upon, without any more ado, as a True Good Chriſtian in reſpect of his Faith*;] though it be very unfairly expreſs'd, and with an ill Spirit, yet ſeems indeed to contain the moſt *material Difficulty* in your whole Book, viz.

How

How Men ſhall know, (ſince Words are nothing without a determinate Senſe,) what is the determinate Senſe of thoſe Fundamental Articles of Faith, which are abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation? I anſwer: They are expreſſed as Clearly in the *Sermons* of Chriſt and in the Writings of his Apoſtles, as the *Spirit of God* thought fit they ſhould be expreſt; and the *Wiſdom of Man* cannot expreſs them more clearly. Whoever reads the *Sermons* of Chriſt and the Writings of his Apoſtles, with a ſincere intent to learn from thence *what he muſt do to be ſaved*, may be *as Certain* of underſtanding the determinate Senſe of the Words wherein *They* expreſs the *Neceſſary Requiſites to Salvation*, as he can be of underſtanding the determinate Senſe of the Words of *Fallible Men*; and *More certain*, of not being led thereby into Error. Theſe *Fundamentals*, the Church has from the Beginning indeavoured briefly to expreſs in the *Baptiſmal Creed*, not as an *Authoritative Explication*, but as an *Inſtructive Summary*. And the *Articles of This Creed*, (eſpecially as it was *worded* in the *Three Firſt Centuries*, which is the Time you appeal to,) are ſo *clear and intelligible*, that, I verily believe, *no ſincere mind* ever miſunderſtood *any one* of them. All the Controverſies in the Chriſtian World, have been either about *Other Parts*

of

of Scripture, which contain *infallibly true Doctrine*, but not *Fundamentally neceſſary to the Salvation of a Chriſtian*; or elſe, (and indeed more frequently,) about the *Authority* and the *determinate Senſe* of the *additional Explications of Men*; Which may indeed well be look'd upon as Queſtions and Speculations about *Truth* and *Error*, but not about *That Faith* by which a Man muſt be *Saved* or *Damned*.

I had ſaid, (*Introduct. pag.* 19,) that it was a great Fault in young Students, to take up their Notions in Divinity *firſt from Humane and Modern Forms of ſpeaking, and then to pick out afterwards (as Proofs) ſome FEW ſingle Texts of Scripture, inſtead of attending to the whole Scope and general Tenour of Scripture in the Firſt place.* To This, you reply: *I muſt crave leave to diſſent herein from the Doctor: For ſurely the Whole is made up of its Parts, and not the Parts of the Whole: And conſequently the Whole Scope and General Tenour of the Scripture is to be known, by knowing the Right Senſe of THE SEVERAL PARTICULAR Texts; and it is Abſurd to ſay on the contrary, that particular Texts are to be Rightly underſtood by the Whole Scope and General Tenour of Scripture; this being in effect to ſay, that the Parts are* pag. 57.

made up of the Whole : Wherefore, ſince in order of Nature I am Firſt rightly to underſtand THE PARTICULAR *Texts of Scripture, before I can underſtand rightly what is the Whole Scope and General Tenour of Scripture ; and conſequently 'tis impoſſible in the nature of the Thing, for me to underſtand the Former by underſtanding the Latter ; hence there is a neceſſity of aſſigning Some Other way, as the Beſt for rightly underſtanding* THE PARTICULAR *Texts or Paſſages of Scripture, and thereby the General Tenour of Scripture : And That Beſt way, is having Recourſe to the Antient Writers, &c.* Now is This a way of arguing, at all becoming a ſerious Writer, pleading in earneſt for what he believes to be the Truth ? *I* made the Diſtinction between *particular Texts* taken ſingly, *a FEW ſingle Texts*, (thoſe were my Words,) on the *one* hand ; and, on the *other* hand, the *Whole Tenour of Scripture*, that is, *ALL the Numerous particular Texts* relating to any one Doctrine, *conſidered and compared Together.* Inſtead of This, *you*, in your Reply, repreſent me as oppoſing *All* the *particular Texts* of Scripture, to the *Whole Tenour* of Scripture ; that is, as oppoſing the *Whole Scripture* to the *Whole Scripture.* And can you really, Sir, have ſo mean an Opinion of your Readers, as to think that I

need

need make Any Anſwer to ſuch kind of Arguments as Theſe?

But there is ſtill *Another* admirable piece of Sagacity, in this Paragraph of yours. The *Whole Scope and General Tenour of Scripture*, we muſt know, cannot be rightly underſtood otherwiſe, than by underſtanding *The Particular Texts*; becauſe the *Whole* muſt needs be made up of its *Parts*: And *The Particular Texts* cannot be underſtood by *attending impartially to the whole Scope and general Tenour of Scripture*, (that is, by conſidering and comparing all thoſe Texts one with another;) becauſe *This*, it ſeems, *is in effect to ſay, that the Parts are made up of the Whole*: THEREFORE there's No way at all to underſtand the Scripture, but by ſome *Other* Help, viz. by the *Antient Fathers*. Is This again the Argument of a *Mathematical* Writer? One of the greateſt Benefits of ſuch Studies, and that which uſes to diſtinguiſh Men who are skilled in That Learning, from Thoſe who are not; is their taking Care that their Concluſion be ſure to follow from their Premiſes: But This, *you* almoſt conſtantly neglect. Apply ſuch Arguing to any other Book in the World; and try if you can perſwade Mankind, that *Tully*'s Offices, or any other Book of Morality, is not to be underſtood by reading: pag. 58.

and ſtudying the Book itſelf, but that the Doctrine taught in *That* Book can be learnt only by ſtudying *Other* Books.

pag. 59. Your next Argument, is Something about *the Acquaintance and Intimacy* certain *Men may have happened to have formerly contracted, as being of the Same Univerſity, and Fellow-Collegiates, and more particularly yet, Chamber-Fellows, and the like.* I ſuppoſe you will be ſurprized, when I tell you, that the Perſons you ſpeak of, not only *never* were *Chamber-Fellows*, but even not ſo much as of the *Same College.* But if the Fact had been True; was it either in itſelf of any *Importance*, or any thing at all to *your* purpoſe? Conſider, Sir, ſeriouſly in your own Mind, whether this Childiſh *Wrath of Man*, can in any degree *work the Righteouſneſs of God*, or be likely in any meaſure to promote Truth and Equity and Charity amongſt *Men.* Is any Man the worſe or the better Chriſtian, or are his Arguments the weaker or the ſtronger, for having lived in the Neighbourhood of ſuch and ſuch particular perſons, or having been in the ſame Houſe or in the ſame Chamber with them? You were *told* this matter for a Truth, no doubt: But does it become a Man of Dr *Wells*'s character, when he de-

pag. 66. clares he is *Not in the leaſt aſhamed to own Publickly*

Publickly his *Name*, and that he has *not only taken Care Himſelf to let nothing drop from his Pen but what was conſiſtent with the True Spirit of Meekneſs and Chriſtianity, but has alſo Submitted theſe* his *Papers to the Judgment of Judicious, truly Pious, and Eminent Perſons in* London, *with full Power to ſtrike out whatever ſhall appear to their Better Judgments Not conſiſtent with the True Spirit of Meekneſs and Chriſtianity:* Does it become Dr *Wells*, with ſuch a Preamble as This, to endeavour meanly to raiſe an Odium amongſt ignorant people againſt a Perſon who never offended him; by publiſhing, with the Authority of his Name to it, a Little *Falſe* Story? and This, without giving himſelf the Trouble ſo much as once to inquire, whether there was any Truth in it or no; though he had Neighbours that were of That Univerſity and of That College he ſpeaks of, who could with the greateſt Eaſe have informed him better? We pretend juſtly to abhorr the Principles of Thoſe Men, who think no *Faith* is to be kept with their Adverſaries? And ſhall *Proteſtants* themſelves, when they happen to differ in Opinion, take No care to keep any meaſures of *Truth* and *Charity?* Becauſe *You* think yourſelf *Orthodox*, (as *I* alſo, and I hope with as good Reaſon, think *My* ſelf;) are you therefore

fore at liberty to raiſe little Calumnies at a venture, and indeavour to blind people with *Prejudice*, inſtead of convincing them by *Reaſon?* If, in matters of Controverſy, Both ſides ſhould make a Cuſtom of allowing themſelves in ſuch Negligence; what a hopeful Example ſhould we ſet to our
Tit. 3, 2. people of the Doctrine we preach, *to ſpeak evil of no Man?* But becauſe I believe This was only *Negligence* in you, and not *Deſign*; I hope the Convictions of your own Conſcience will make you to be more cautious for the future, and to conſider of how Ill Example *Such ſort of Negligence* is.

But to proceed: In your next Obſervation, (upon my cautioning Men to be guided, not by the *Sound* of ſingle Texts, but by the *Senſe* and *whole Tenour* of Scripture,) you are again playing with Words, in a manner which does not greatly become
pag. 59. ſo ſerious a Subject. *Becauſe St Paul*, (you ſay,) *ſpeaking of Chriſt, affirms of him*, (Rom. 9, 5,) *that He* is OVER ALL, GOD *bleſſed for ever, We are not therefore (for avoiding being miſguided by the* Sound *of this ſingle Text,) to underſtand the True Senſe of the ſaid Text to be This*, viz. *that Chriſt* is NOT OVER ALL, GOD *bleſſed for ever.* As if (beſides your unfairneſs in concealing from your Reader the

the *Ambiguity of the words* of that Text in the Original,) every Child could not underſtand, that He who, with reſpect to the *whole Creation made ſubject* to him, *is GOD OVER ALL*; yet at the ſame time, with reſpect to Him who *ſubjected all things* to him, *is NOT GOD OVER ALL:* It being *Manifeſt*, (as St *Paul* obſerves,) that is to ſay, *manifeſt to the common Senſe of Mankind*, without needing to be often repeated; that *He who ſubjected all things to the Dominion of Chriſt*, (namely, *GOD*, even *THE FATHER*, as the ſame Apoſtle takes Care to explain himſelf,) muſt needs be exempted from being Himſelf ſubject to That Dominion.

1 Cor. 15, 27.

1 Cor. 15, 24.

The like Trifling, follows again in the next words: *Becauſe* (you ſay) *St John affirms* (1 Joh. 5, 7,) *that Theſe Three* ARE ONE, *We are not therefore (for avoiding being miſguided by the* Sound *of this ſingle Text) to underſtand the True Senſe of the Text to be This, Theſe Three* ARE NOT ONE. As if things that in one Senſe may be truly ſaid *to be One*, might not as truly in another Senſe be ſaid *not to be One*. Beſides, that you exceedingly abuſe your Engliſh Reader, when you entirely conceal from him, both that the word, *One*, has not in the Original That Ambi-

Pag. 59.

guity,

guity, which it has in Engliſh ; and alſo that the *Whole Text itſelf*, (for ought that yet appears,) has been wanting in *Every* manuſcript Copy of the Original, that Is or ever Was in the World. Of which matter, more has been ſpoken above.

And ſtill once again, in the following
pag. 59. words : *And ſo, verſe* 20*th of the ſame Chapter, becauſe it is ſaid*, This *(that is,* [you ſay,] *Jeſus Chriſt,)* IS THE TRUE GOD, *We are not therefore (for fear of being miſguided by the* Sound *of the ſaid Text) to underſtand its True Meaning to be This,* viz. This IS NOT THE TRUE GOD. As if it were not very plainly conſiſtent, to affirm of Chriſt, with regard to Dominion over *Us* and the *whole Creation*, that He *is Truly God* ; and yet that at the ſame time, with regard to the *Supreme Father of All*, Chriſt *is not* He (or That Perſon) who in Scripture is ſtiled by way of Eminence [ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός] *The True God* and *The Only True God*. But Here alſo again you uſe your Engliſh Reader very unfairly, when you Thus cite the Text, *This (that is, Jeſus Chriſt) is the True God* ; as if That were, without any Ambiguity, the Signification of the words in the Original : Which is by no means the Caſe. For though the thing it ſelf,

ſelf, underſtood in a right Senſe, and according to the Analogy of Scripture, is undoubtedly true, that *Jeſus Chriſt* is *Truly God*; yet That is *not* the Aſſertion of this Text. *We know* (ſays the Apoſtle) *that the Son of God is come*; *and hath given us an Underſtanding, that we may know Him that is True*, [τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν, *the True God*; ſo the moſt and beſt MSS have it; in like manner as *Joh.* 17, 3;] *And we Are in Him that is True*, [in *the True God*; So the Conſtruction manifeſtly requires it to be underſtood, of the ſame Perſon as before; ἵνα γινώσκωμεν ΤΟΝ ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΝ (θεὸν,) καὶ ἐσμεν ἐν ΤΩ ΑΛΗΘΙΝΩ; *and we are in That true God*,] *In* (that is, *By*) *his Son Jeſus Chriſt: This is the True God, and eternal Life*; *Little Children, keep yourſelves from Idols.* The Meaning plainly is: This is the True God, whom the Son of God has given us an Underſtanding to know, and in whom we Are by His means: That is to ſay, This is the True Religion, and the Way to eternal Life, (*viz.* the Worſhip of this True God by and through his Son Jeſus Chriſt;) Beware of Idol-worſhip. Thus, *verſe* 11*th* of this Chapter: *This is the Record, that God hath given to us eternal Life, and This Life is IN* [that is, *By* or *Through*] *his Son.*

pag. 60. Your next citation, of the Two Texts out of *St Peter* and *Iſaiah*, concerning Chriſt's ſuffering *for our Sins* or *not for our Sins*; is either *not at all pertinent*, which is the Beſt that can be ſuppoſed of it; or elſe it is intended to ſuggeſt a moſt *unrighteous* inſinuation, as if I had ſaid any thing in diminution of Chriſt's ſuffering *for our Sins*; for which ſuggeſtion, I have no where given you ſo much as the leaſt Colour. But as he that breaks the *Law* in *One* point, is guilty of *All*; ſo (it ſeems) whoſoever differs from *your Opinion* in any *one* caſe, may lawfully be charged by you with any *other* Errour whatſoever. Will it not better become us All to conſider; *As a Mad-man, who caſteth Fire-brands, Arrows and Death*; *ſo is the Man that* Revileth *his Neighbour, and ſaith, Am not I in Sport?*

Prov. 26, 18.

pag. 60. To your Obſervations upon my *Aſſent to the Forms by Law appointed*, my Anſwer is; that by having plainly declared my Opinion, *aſſoon as it was poſſible* for me to collect the materials neceſſary to determine it, without regarding (as you unjuſtly ſugg ſt) at what Time it might *moſt prudentially* be done; I have, with all decent Modeſty, ſubmitted That whole matter

ter to the Judgment of my *Superiours*, and taken care not to impose upon my *Inferiours* or *Equals*. Whether Assenting to Any words of humane Institution, in the Manner which *Your* whole Argument aims at, merely in reliance upon the *general* Authority of *Tradition*, without considering in *particular* how and in what sense 'tis possible the words assented to may be understood consistently both with the Scripture and with Themselves compared together; Whether, I say, This way of Assenting, how much soever it may possibly tend to a sort of *Peace*, can in any wise tend to the promoting of *True Religion*, I shall not here take upon me to determine.

As to the *Difficulty* you are afraid there may be *in Dispossessing* me *of* my *Preferment*; How This tends to show the Reader any *Weakness* in *MY Argument*, I understand not: But I am very sorry to see, (for *your* sake, much more than for my *own*,) that a Man of your Abilities should Thus declare, wherein (he thinks) consists the chief *Strength* of *HIS*. In This matter, Sir, *you know not what Spirit you are of*. God be thanked, the Protestant Religion has not yet renounced the *Essential Principle* upon which it is built. For, *pag.* 62.

were any whole Church, of That Spirit which the Conſequences of your *preſent* Arguing lead to, (I hope it is not your *ſettled* and *calm* Opinion;) I aſſure you, it would be *no Difficulty at all*, to prevent Me from being a Member of ſuch a Church.

I ſhall conclude the Whole, with ſetting before you, as in a Glaſs, a lively and exact Picture of the *different Spirits* of Men, in the Words of a Perſon as heartily Zealous for the Authority and Traditions of the Church, as any Learned *PROTESTANT* in Chriſtendom. It is the ingenious *Robert Nelſon* Eſq; in his Life of the Right Reverend Biſhop *Bull*; ſpeaking concerning the Biſhops Explication of the Doctrine of *Juſtification*, which is *Now* as univerſally received and followed, as it was *Then* contrary to the general Opinion of Divines.

Now

Now (says Mr Nelson,) *as the Method of our Author* [Bishop Bull] *was always to seek Truth at the Fountain-head; Whatever Respect he might have for our First Reformers, and some other great Divines both Foreigners and Natives, he could by no means take up with their AUTHORITY, though never so pompously set off; but was for going directly to the very Originals themselves.——Accordingly he betakes himself, in the very first place, to the Holy Scriptures; and here he prudently beginneth with that which is obvious and plain, rather than with that which is ambiguous and obscure.* Mr Nelson's Life of Bp Bull, pag. 104.

Notwithstanding all which caution of his in the treating of this Point, that had been rendred so abstruse, more by the laborious disputations of Divines, than by the Nature of the Thing itself, or of the Revelation concerning it; there was presently no small Alarm, both in the Church and out of it, from Mr Bull's *performance; as if the Church of England, and the whole Protestant Religion, were by it in danger. For, his departing herein from the private Opinions of some Doctors of our Church, tho' in Obedience to her Rule, was by several interpreted for no less than a departing*

ing from the Faith by her delivered. pag. 97.

There arose in the Church no small contention, whether this Interpretation of Scripture were conformable to the Articles of Religion, and the Homily of Justification therein referred to. Some maintained—— that it was; some doubted about it; and others downright denied it, and condemned it as Heretical. *There was many a hard Censure passed upon the Book and the Author, for some time; Which is not to be wondred at.* pag. 98.

Some *mightily triumphed over him for—— not attending enough to the Doctrine of his own Church.* pag. 225.

Others, *as if he were not only to be held for an Heretick by the Church, but even for an Heresiarch too.* pag. 211.

That M. Bull's *explication of the Doctrine of* Justification, *was properly Heretical; as being contrary, in a fundamental point, to the Testimony of Scripture, and against the Opinion of the Catholick Fathers, the judgment of the Church of* England, *and the determinations of all the foreign Reformed Churches.* pag. 214.

Some *stirred up several of the Bishops—— to make Use of their Apostolical Authority in thundring out their Anathema's against the Doctrines here maintained, as pernicious and*

and heretical, and contrary to the Decrees of the Church of England, *and of all other Reformed Churches.* Theſe were *quickly ſeconded in This by ſome* Others, *partly known, and partly unknown; of whom Some that underſtood but little of the matter, were, as it often happens, the hotteſt of all againſt him, and were for puſhing things to the utmoſt extremity: But moderate Counſels prevailed for the moſt part; and the Governours of the Church were ſo wiſe, as not to intermeddle further in this affair, than to keep the Peace of the Church committed to them.* pag. 101.

Some there were, more violent than the reſt; of whom He complaineth, that they made very Tragical Outcries againſt him, as if by ſuch an Hypotheſis as This, " *the* " *whole Syſtem of Orthodox Divinity ſhould* " *be ſhaken, yea broken to pieces and ut-* " *terly deſtroyed; and that the very Foun-* " *dations both of Law and Goſpel were* " *hereby at once undermined and overturn-* " *ed.* pag. 166.

Some there were more wiſe and learned than the reſt, who yet approved it not, that they might not appear guilty of Innovating, *as they called it. And it could not be digeſted by them,——becauſe the Prejudices which a great many worthy perſons among us had ſucked in from the narrow Syſtems*

of

of modern Divinity or otherwiſe,——were too ſtrong for them entirely to overcome, even with the Help of the cleareſt Light. pag. 98.

Some *were among the moſt zealous to oppoſe,——by their rigid adherence to certain Tenets by them formerly imbibed, and to ſome Scholaſtick Terms unſupported either by Scripture or Antiquity.* pag. 102.

There could have been no difficulty concerning——; had either the ſtate of the controverſy in the Apoſtles days been attended to as it ought, or perſons had not come with their modern Opinions and Prejudices to read the Apoſtolical Epiſtles; not ſo much, very often, to learn what is the Truth, as to eſtabliſh themſelves thereby in what they are already, by the Tradition of a Sect, prepoſſeſſed with to be the Truth. pag. 123.

Some, *not allowing* themſelves *time to think ſedately, or even to examine ſufficiently the ſenſe of an Author who pleaſed* them *not; being fired with a Zeal for what they took for Truth, from the Syſtems which* they *had greedily ſucked in as Authentick Explications of the Goſpel; intirely loſt* themſelves *thereby, and expoſed the very cauſe* they *undertook to defend.* pag. 146.

They

They *ſet* themſelves *to defend* their *own Scheme, as the only Orthodox one; thinking that Mr* Bull *would make an intolerable Change in the very Subſtance of the Body of Divinity.* pag. 172.

But *He* [viz. Mr Bull] *affirms it to be moſt unreaſonable and againſt the Principles of the Church of England, to prefer the Authority of any modern Doctor or Doctors whatſoever, before a Truth grounded upon Scripture, with the unanimous conſent of the Catholick Church.* pag. 235.

Yet with much ingenuity He confeſſes that——" *matters were come to that paſs,* " *that it was hardly ſafe for any One* " *to interpret either the Articles of our* " *Church, or even the* Holy Scriptures " *themſelves, otherwiſe than according to* " *the Standard of* Calvins Inſtitutions; " *Whoſe Errour therefore, (ſaith he,) ought* " *not ſo much to be imputed to Them,* " *as to the Age wherein they lived: Since* " *almoſt in every Age, as One has well* " *obſerved, there is as it were a certain* " Torrent *of opinions proper to it, againſt* " *which whoſoever ſhall go to oppoſe him-* " *ſelf, he ſhall certainly either be carried* " *away with the Violence thereof, or be* " *quite overwhelmed*". *This is an Obſervation that is very juſt:*——*Nay, did*

 I know

The great Duty of universal Love and Charity. A Sermon preached before the Queen, at St. *James*'s Chapel, pr. *6 d.*

A Sermon preach'd at the Lady *Cooke*'s Funeral, pr. *1 d.*

A Sermon preach'd before the House of Commons, pr. *2 d.*

A Sermon preach'd before the Queen on the 8th of March, 1709-10. pr. *2 d.*

A Sermon preach'd at St. *James*'s Church on the Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 7th, 1710. pr. *3 d.*

The Government of Passion. A Sermon preach'd before the Queen at St *James*'s Chapel. pr. *3 d.*

Jacobi Rohaulti Physica. Latine vertit, recensuit, & uberioribus jam Annotationibus ex illustrissimi *Isaaci Neutoni* Philosophia maximam partem hausti, amplificavit & ornavit *S. Clarke.* Accedunt etiam in hac tertia Editione, novæ aliquot Tabulæ æri incisæ; & Annotationes multum sunt auctæ, *8vo.* Price *8 s.*

Is. Neutoni Optice. Latinè reddidit *S. Clarke*, S. T. P.

The *Scripture-Doctrine* of the Trinity. In Three Parts. Wherein all the *Texts* in the New Testament relating to that Doctrine, and the principal Passages in the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, are collected, compared, and explain'd. pr. *6 s.*

The Rights of the Clergy of the Christian Church: Or, A Discourse shewing, that God has given and appropriated to the Clergy, Authority to Ordain, Baptize, preach, preside in Church-Prayer, and Consecrate the Lord's Supper. Wherein also the pretended Divine Right of the Layety to Elect, either the Persons to be Ordained, or their own particular Pastors, is Examined and Disproved. By *Thomas Bennet*, M. A. Rector of St. *James*'s in *Colchester.* pr. *5 s.*

A Paraphrase and Annotations on the Book of Common-Prayer, *8vo.* pr. *4 s.*

A Letter to Mr. *Benjamin Robinson*, on his Review of Liturgies and their Imposition. pr. *2 s. 6 d.*

A Second Letter to Mr. *Robinson.* pr. *1 s.*

A FULL ACCOUNT OF THE Late Proceedings in Convocation Relating to Dr *Clarke's* Writings about the TRINITY

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY 1822

Containing True Copies of

I. The Complaint of the *Lower-House.*
II. The Answer of the *Bishops.*
III. Their Message to the *Lower-House*, directing an *Extract* of *Particulars.*
IV. The *Extract* of *Particulars* laid before the *Bishops* by the *Lower-House.*
V. Dr *Clarke's* Paper delivered to the *Bishops.*
VI. The Resolution of the *Bishops* upon that Paper; which was Communicated to the *Lower-House.*

Together with an Account of the Resolution of the *Lower-House* upon it.

With Some Short Remarks.

LONDON, Printed for *John Baker*, at the *Black Boy* in *Pater-Noster Row*. 1714. Price 6 *d.*

Advertiſement.

THE *Proceedings in* Convocation, *relating to* Dr Clarke, *having made a great Noiſe in the World, as well on account of his great Reputation, as of the Controverſy to which they relate; and Imperfect Copies of ſome Particulars of theſe Proceedings, having been already Publiſhed and Diſper-*

 ſed;

ſed; One *who had the Curioſity to procure a* True Account *of every thing as it paſſed, thinks it not improper that the World ſhould now ſee the whole at one View.*

He hopes that the Reverend Body, *whoſe* Complaint *began theſe Proceedings, will not look on this* Publication *as an Injury, ſince it will reſcue their Conduct from ſuch* Imperfect Miſrepreſentations, *and ſerve to place their* Zeal *for the* Church, *in its true Light. And the Reverend Dr* Clarke, *He preſumes, will have no reaſon to complain of it, ſince it contains an* Exact Copy

Copy *of what he delivered to the* Biſhops, *both with reſpect to his own Opinion, and the* Peace *of the* Church.

THE

THE COMPLAINT Of the *Lower-House*,

June 2. 1714.

To His Grace the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, *and the Lords the Bishops of the Province of* Canterbury *in Convocation assembled.*

The Clergy of the Lower-House of Convocation Humbly Represent,

THAT a Book hath of late been published and dispersed throughout this Province, Intituled, *The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. In Three Parts. Wherein all the Texts in the New Testament relating to that Doctrine, and the Principal Passages in*

in the Liturgy of the Church of England *are collected, compared, and explained. By* Samuel Clarke, *D. D. Rector of St* James's Weſtminſter, *and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majeſty*; And ſeveral Defenſes thereof, by the ſame Author. Which Book and Defenſes do, in our Opinion, contain Aſſertions contrary to the Catholick Faith, as received and declared by this Reformed Church of *England*, concerning *Three Perſons of One Subſtance, Power and Eternity, in the Unity of the Godhead*: And tending moreover to perplex the Minds of Men in the Solemn Acts of Worſhip, as directed by our Eſtabliſhed Liturgy, to the great Grief and Scandal of pious and ſober-minded Chriſtians.

And whereas there are diverſe Paſſages in the Book of Common-Prayer, and in the Thirty-nine Articles, which are directly oppoſed to ſuch Heretical Aſſertions, We do

further

further repreſent to your Lordſhips, That even theſe Paſſages have by the ſaid Author been wreſted with ſuch Subtlety, as may both teach and tempt the Unſtable and Inſincere to comply with the Laws, which require them to declare their unfeigned Aſſent and Conſent to the ſaid Book of Common-Prayer, and to ſubſcribe to the ſaid Articles, and nevertheleſs to retain and propagate the very Errours, which are moſt inconſiſtent with ſuch their Declaration and Subſcription.

It is with the utmoſt Concern that we behold theſe daring and dangerous Attempts, to ſubvert our Common Faith, to corrupt the Chriſtian Worſhip, and to defeat the Church's main End in *agreeing upon her Articles*; namely, *The avoiding of Diverſities of Opinions, and the eſtabliſhing of Conſent touching True Religion.*

And We cannot therefore but think our ſelves bound, in Duty to God and his Church, in Diſcharge of the weighty Truſt repoſed in Us as Members of this Synod, and in Charity to the Souls committed to our Care, moſt earneſtly to beſeech your Lordſhips to take the Premiſes into your Serious and Godly Conſideration; Aſſuring your Lordſhips of our moſt Dutiful and Ready Concurrence in any proper Methods, which may effectually put a Stop to this growing Miſchief, and remove from our ſelves the Reproach, which our Silence on ſo important an Occaſion might juſtly bring upon Us.

THE

THE

ANSWER

OF THE

Bishops.

THE Bishops highly approve the Zeal of the Lower-House for the Preservation of the Catholick Faith, expressed in their Representation, laid before this House the last Session; wherein they declare their Concern for the great Scandal given to Pious and Sober-minded Christians, by some Books lately published by Dr *Clarke*, and their Apprehension of the Mischiefs and dangerous Consequences that may ensue

thereupon. The Biſhops think the Lower-Houſe had juſt Reaſon for ſuch their Complaint, and will take it into their Conſideration what is proper to do on this Occaſion.

Their

Their MESSAGE *to the Lower-House, directing an* Extract *of* Particulars *out of the* Books *complain'd of.*

THE Bishops having taken into their Consideration what is proper to be done in relation to the Book, and several Defenses thereof, complained of by the Lower-House on the 2d of this Instant *June*, do think it proper that (for the clearer Proceeding of the Convocation in this Matter) an Extract should be made of those Passages in the said Books, which give greatest Offense and are most liable to Censure. And they do recommend it to the Lower-House, that

that they would with all convenient Speed prepare such an Extract and lay it before this House, together with their Observations thereupon.

The

The EXTRACT *of* PARTICULARS *laid before the* Biſhops, *by the* Lower-Houſe.

May it pleaſe your Grace and your Lordſhips.

THE Lower-Houſe, in purſuance of what your Lordſhips were pleaſed to recommend to them in your Paper of the 12th Inſtant, have extracted ſome Paſſages out of *Dr Clarke's Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, and the *Defenſes* thereof, and have diſpoſed the *Extract* they have made under the following Heads, with a diſtinct Regard to the ſeveral Matters of Complaint, contain'd in their late Repreſentation.

I. Aſſer-

I. Assertions contrary to the Catholick Faith, as received and declared by this Reformed Church of *England*, concerning Three Persons of One Substance, Power and Eternity, in the Unity of the Godhead.

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, pag. 465. lin. 2.

"If it [*i. e.* the Word, ὁμοούσιος, "which we translate *of One Substance with the Father*] be understood to "signifie —— *One Individual Substance*, this will be properly —— "*One Subsistence*, or *One Person* only.

Letter to Dr Wells, pag. 47. l. 10.

"Now this, I say, [*viz. That in the Godhead there are Three Persons of the same Divine Individual Essence*] is an express Contradiction in "the very Terms.

Answer

Answer to the Author of some Considerations, p. 224. l. 12.

" If the Father, the Son, and the " Holy Spirit, be conceived to be " All but *One* Individual Being; it " follows of necessity, that the Son " and Holy Spirit have *no Being at* " *all.*

Ibid. pag. 289. lin. 8.

" That *Two Persons* should be *One* " *Being*, is (I think) a manifest Con- " tradiction.

Ibid. pag. 297. lin. 4.

" This [*viz. That the Father and* " *Son are Both but One and the Same* " *Individual Being*] I think, is an ex- " press Contradiction.

N. B. That the Words *Essence*, *Being*, and *Substance*, are used by this Author as equivalent Terms, *vid. Scripture-Doctrine*, pag. 243. lin. 1

and 9. pag. 270 § XII. lin. 2. pag 272. lin. 2. pag. 289 § XIX. lin. 2. pag. 349 § XL. lin. 2. pag. 350 § XLI. lin. 2. pag. 372. § LI. lin. 3. p. 373. lin. 19.

Answer to the Author of some Considerations, p. 229. l. 9.

Scripture-Doctrine, p. 429. l. 10. "There are not— Three Eternal "Persons.

Ibid. lin. 17. "There are not— "Three Uncreated Persons.

Ibid. lin. penult. "There are not "—Three Almighty Persons.

II. Passages tending to perplex the Minds of Men in the Solemn Acts of Worship, as directed by our Established Liturgy.

All the Passages before-cited have, in Our Opinion, this Tendency: More particularly those whereby the Author

Author pretends to explain ſome Expreſſions in the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian* Creeds, which are Parts of our Divine Service.

Of the like Tendency are his Comments [*Scripture-Doctrine*, Part III. Chap. II. pag. 415, *&c.*] upon divers other Expreſſions in the ſaid Creeds, in the Doxology, Litany, Collects, and other Offices of Devotion. In which the Church manifeſtly intends the Worſhip of the Trinity in Unity, and aſcribes one and the ſame Glory to the Three Perſons, without any Difference or Inequality.

But the moſt Offenſive Paſſage under this Head ſeems to be in *pag.* 476 of the ſaid Book: Where having firſt connected the proper Preface for *Trinity Sunday* with the Words, *O Lord* [*Holy Father*] *Al-*

mighty, Everlasting God, without taking notice that the Words [*Holy Father*] are expressly order'd to be omitted on that Day,

He afterwards asserts, that the first, obvious, natural and grammatical Sound of the whole Sentence, is, that the *Person of the Father* is not *One Only Person*, but *Three Persons*. Which Proceeding of this Author is not only a manifest and gross Misrepresentation of this particular Form of Devotion, but tendeth greatly to perplex the Minds of Men in the Use of it, by insinuating, that whilst they are here acknowledging the *One God* to be *Not One Only Person*, but *Three Persons* in One Substance, they are all the while addressing themselves to the *Person* of the *Father* singly, and absurdly declaring *Him* to be *Not One Only Person*, but *Three Persons*.

III.

III. Paſſages in the Liturgy and XXXIX Articles, wreſted by Dr *Clarke* in ſuch Manner as is complain'd of in the Repreſentation.

For theſe we refer to the whole Second Chapter of Part III. of the *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, Compar'd with *Page* 24 and 25 of the *Introduction*. In the ſaid Second Chapter, He explains many Paſſages in the Liturgy and Articles, in a Senſe directly contrary to the known Senſe of the Church; and in the Introduction He deſires it may be obſerved, that he gives his Aſſent to the Forms by Law appointed in That Senſe Only, wherein He himſelf hath explained them.

The Lower-Houſe are perſwaded, the foregoing Extract does fully ſupport their Repreſentation.

But moreover we beg leave to obſerve,

obſerve, that the Offence given by the Books complain'd of, ſeems to Us to ariſe not only from ſuch particular Parts and Paſſages thereof as are before-cited, but from the general Drift and Deſign of the whole; the ſaid Books, in our Opinion, tending to nothing leſs, than to ſubſtitute the Author's private Conceits, and arbitrary Interpretations of Scripture, in the Room of thoſe Catholic Doctrines, which the Church profeſſes and maintains, as warranted both by Scripture and Antiquity.

Exhib. 23. *Junii.* 1714.
Joh. London Commiſſar.

RE-

REMARKS.

SOME may be apt to obſerve that throughout this *Extract*, and the former *Repreſentation*, there is no Complaint, either that *any* of thoſe numerous Texts of the New Teſtament cited by Dr. *Clarke* in the Firſt Part of his *Scripture-Doctrine* are miſrepreſented; or that *any* of the *Propoſitions* laid down in his *Second Part* are falſe in themſelves: nay, that the *Catholick Faith*, conſidered as ſuch, is not the Subject of the preſent Concern of the *Lower-Houſe*; but the *Catholick Faith as received and declared by this Reformed Church of England*; *and the Catholick Doctrines which the Church profeſſeth, and maintains, as warranted both by Scripture and Antiquity*; but not the *Doctrines* ſo *warranted*, diſtinct from ſuch *Profeſſion* of the *Church*. But this will be no ſurprize to any, but ſuch as think that *Eſtabliſhment* is no certain Mark of *Truth*; and that *Humane Authority* in Religion is not *Inconteſtable*; and that Matters ſettled for many Years, by Men in Power, are not to be always left Sacred and untouch'd.

Others

Others may wonder at the mention of *this Reformed Church*, in the preſent Queſtion; under Pretence that it happens, in this particular Point, that the *Doctrine* here fixed upon this Church belongs not at all to it, as *Reformed*; but is enjoyed by it in common with the *Unreformed Church of Rome*; to whoſe *Scholaſtic Writers* the Eſtabliſhment of thoſe Terms, and *Language*, in which only it is here allowed to be expreſſed, is entirely owing; being utterly, as they ſay, unheard of, and unknown, in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity. But theſe again are ſuch as fondly imagine that the *Church*, conſidered as *Reformed*, is wholly founded on that Principle of ſending all *Chriſtians* to the *Scriptures*, and not to her *ſelf*, or any *Humane Authority*, for a *Rule* of *Faith* or *Practice*. No wonder, if ſuch as theſe ſhould be ſurpriz'd at this; or at a *Proteſtant Synod*'s Complaint of the *Doctor*'s *Interpretations* of Scripture, as of his own *Private Conceits*, and *Arbitrary Interpretations*; when ſuch Perſons are not aſhamed often to profeſs that *Proteſtantiſm* could never ſo much as have been in Being, but by departing from the Publick Interpretations, and Doctrines, of a *Vaſt Church*, in a long continued Poſſeſſion; and by having recourſe to private Interpretations, with the beſt Helps that Learning and Integrity afforded. They

To the ſame purpoſe, They urge that the Interpretations of *Scripture* made uſe of by the firſt Patrons of this *Reformed Church* were, at the Time of the *Reformation*, ſtyl'd by their Adverſaries *Private Conceits*, and *Arbitrary Interpretations*; and complain'd of, as *ſubſtituted in the room of thoſe Catholick Doctrines which the then Church profeſſed and maintained*: But that the *Reformers* thought it a good Anſwer, that *no Church was infallible*, that the *Scripture was the Rule for every one to go by*; and that there was no Way of underſtanding that, but the Way of *Private Judgment*, ſupported by the beſt Aſſiſtances. They pretend that the only conſiſtent Reply to this is, that this was only the great and haſty Zeal of the *Reformers*; but that they did not conſider of what fatal Conſequence it was, to deſtroy the *Infallibility* of one Church, without ſetting up another, with the ſame Authority, in it's Stead; that the *Reformed Church* having by Degrees ſettled every thing upon the beſt Grounds poſſible, no uſe of *Judgement* was from that time left to any of its Members; and that when once the *Private Conceits* and *Arbitrary Interpretations* of our *Reformers* came to be Eſtabliſhed, they preſently became,

at least in some Instances, *Publick Interpretations*, and *Catholick Doctrines*, no more to be contested. And therefore when it is asked by many, Where would the Peace of the *Church* be, if any Persons (besides themselves,) be allowed to suppose any Proposition, or Interpretation, to be wrong, which that hath received, and maintained? These Persons answer, by asking, Where would this *Reformed Church* it self have been, without sending all its Members, even with their own Private *Judgments*, (or *Conceits*, if you please) from the *Church* to the *Scriptures*?

But however this be, There are those, I find, who think that it deserved *Thanks* rather than Censure from this *Reverend Body*, to attempt to reconcile the several differing Expressions, in our *publick Offices*, to one another; and to shew in how good a Sense they may all be taken; that this was so far from tending to distract the Minds of Men in Worship, that without some such Method (on one Side, or other) they must remain for ever *distracted*. —— But these again are such as do not consider how tenacious Men think they should be of every Expression, that hath

hath been once fix'd to a more than ordinary mysterious and solemn Sense; and that all such *Interpretations* and *Explications* tend to draw aside the Minds of Men from patiently and humbly acquiescing in what is laid upon them by their Ecclesiastical Superiors.

Lastly, They pretend to urge that Dr *Clarke* produceth many of the *plainest* Expressions of our *Church* it self, in his own Favour, which it is impossible to understand in the contrary way; that He perpetually cites many of our own principal, and most famous Divines, as agreeing with him in those *Interpretations* of *Scripture*, which are most objected against, and in those *Premises* from which his *Conclusions* inevitably follow; and, what is more, that He hath alledged a great Number of the very *first Writers* of *Christianity*, who agree with him in those Interpretations, and quoted the most undeniable, and plainest Passages out of them, for all the principal Branches of His Opinion; many more in Number, and plainer in Expression, than can possibly be produced against Him: And upon these accounts, they pretend to think it wholly

ly unaccountable, as well as unparallel'd, that *Opinions*, and *Interpretations*, thus back'd, ſhou'd be repreſented under the contemptuous Notion of *Private Conceits*, and *Arbitrary Interpretations*.

But I only mention theſe, as the Obſervations of ſome Perſons, to whom it is very difficult to give a *Reply* that will ſatisfy them, till they become more diſpos'd to give up their Underſtandings to their *Superiours*.

Soon after this *Extract* was delivered to the *Biſhops*, as I am inform'd the Dr. drew up, what he thought an *Anſwer* to every Branch of it; which he communicated to ſeveral of them. But as I know no way of procuring a Copy of it, the World muſt be without it, unleſs He himſelf ſhall (as is much to be deſired,) judge it proper to publiſh it.

One thing there is, which ſeems to ſome to preſs cloſe, tho' not upon his Caſe, yet upon his Perſonal Conduct; and that is, His *Subſcription*, and Declaration of *Aſſent* and *Conſent*, whilſt he holds Opinions ſuppoſed to be contrary to the *Declarations* of the *Church*. He hath himſelf given an Account of

of this in his Anſwer to Mr *Nelſon*. How ſatisfactory, every one that reads it muſt judge. His Friends, I find, think they ſufficiently defend him theſe following ways. 1. They argue, that ſuppoſing him, when he at firſt ſubſcribed the *Liturgy* and *Articles*, not to have differed at all from what is here taken to be the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, then all muſt allow his Subſcription to be Honeſt and Sincere; and that ſuppoſing him afterwards by Conſideration to have changed his Mind, it is ſo far from being diſhoneſt, that it is the heighth of *Integrity* to lay his preſent Thoughts openly before the World, for his Superiors to judge whether they think fit to tolerate them, or not. 2. That ſuppoſing Him to be of the ſame Mind when he firſt ſubſcribed, which he hath now declared, His Subſcription could not affect His Honeſty, becauſe He was fully perſwaded that all the moſt plain and moſt intelligible Expreſſions in our *Church-Service*, relating to this Point, are manifeſtly on His Side; and becauſe it cannot be accounted diſhoneſt to endeavour, in the Caſe of ſuch a Difference of Expreſſions, to interpret the obſcure, and the leſs intelligible, by the plain ones, whoſe meaning is certain. 3. They alledge that this was the Caſe of *Arch-Biſhop Laud*,

Laud, and *Bishop Bull*, with respect to the *Arminian Doctrines*. 4. They offer to maintain that this must be the Case of all the most *Orthodox* of his *Adversaries* themselves; nay, they pretend to be ready to shew that the difficulty is greater on *Their* Side than on *His*; and that it is next to impossible for *them* to reconcile what they profess to be their Doctrine, with many of the plainest Expressions in the *Creeds*, and *Service*, of our *Church*. 5. That supposing the *Church* at first to have made use of such a Variety of Expressions upon this Subject, it cannot be dishoneſt for Men of differing Notions to *Subscribe*, in this Case, any more than in others, untill Some *Authentick Act* be solemnly and regularly pass'd, to declare whether the *Plainest*, and most *Antient* Expressions shall yield to the more *Obscure and Modern*; or whether the Sense of *these* shall be conformed to the *others*. 6. They averr that this is the Case, in some Instance or other, of *every Conforming Clergyman* in *England*, who subscribes with any Thought or Consideration of what He is about. 7. That, therefore, there can be no Danger from such Precedents, unless it be dangerous that Men should be Encouraged to endeavour to put some fixt and determinate

nate Senſe, (the beſt they can,) upon the Offices and Declarations, they are to ſubſcribe, making the plaineſt and cleareſt Expreſſions their Rule to go by, in dubious Caſes; which, they argue, cannot be diſhoneſt, till ſome *Authentick Act* hath plainly declared againſt it. After this manner, They pleaſe themſelves in defending Him, and in Him all the *conforming Clergy* (who in ſome Point or other are in much the ſame Caſe) from the Imputation of Diſhoneſty, or Diſingenuity, in their Subſcription. With what Juſtice I do not determine.

The Noiſe of this Affair before the *Convocation*, now increaſing in the Wold; Dr *Clarke* gave in the following Paper to the *Biſhops*, hoping, without doubt, that it might well paſs for a Demonſtration, that He regarded the *Peace* of the Church, next to his own *Innocence* and Integrity; and that he was ready to do all that he could with a ſafe Conſcience, for the Sake of it.

Dr.

Dr. *CLARKE*'s

PAPER

Deliver'd to the *Bishops*.

Concerning the Eternity of the Son and Holy Spirit.

MY Opinion is, That the Son of God was Eternally begotten by the Eternal Incomprehensible *Power* and *Will* of the Father; and that the Holy Spirit was likewise Eternally derived from the Father, by, or through the Son, according to the Eternal Incomprehensible *Power* and *Will* of the Father.

Con-

Concerning Preaching.

Before my Book, Intitul'd, *The Scripture-Doctrine* &c. was Publiſh'd, I did indeed Preach two or three Sermons upon this Subject; but ſince the Book was Publiſh'd, I have never Preached upon this Subject: And (becauſe I think it not fair to propoſe particular Opinions, when there is not Liberty of Anſwering,) I am willing to promiſe (as indeed I intended) not to preach any more on this Subject.

Concerning Writing.

I do not intend to write any more concerning the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: But if I ſhall fail herein, and write any thing hereafter, upon that Subject, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, I do hereby willingly ſubmit my ſelf to any

ſuch Cenſure, as my Superiors ſhall think fit to paſs upon me.

And whereas it has been confidently reported, That the *Athanaſian* Creed, and the 3*d* and 4*th* Petitions of the *Litany*, have been omitted in my Church, by my Direction, I do hereby declare, That the 3*d* and 4*th* Petitions of the *Litany* have never been omitted at all, as far as I know; and that the *Athanaſian* Creed was never omitted at Eleven a Clock Prayers, but at the Early Prayers only, for brevity ſake, at the diſcretion of the Curate, and not by my Appointment.

As to my Private Converſation, I am not conſcious to my ſelf, that I have given any juſt Occaſion for thoſe Reports which have been ſpread concerning me, with relation to this Controverſy.

I am ſorry that what I ſincerely intended for the Honour and Glory of God, and ſo to Explain this great Myſtery, as to avoid the Hereſies in both Extreams, ſhould have given any Offence to this *Synod*, and particularly to my Lords the Biſhops. I hope my Behaviour for the time to come, with relation hereunto, will be ſuch, as to prevent any future Complaint againſt me.

Beſides this Paper, it is known that the Dr immediately drew up a *ſecond*, in which (to prevent all poſſible Miſtake, and to explain more clearly what He had before drawn up in haſte,) He declared, that his Opinion, delivered in the *former Paper*, was not different from what He had before profeſs'd and maintain'd in his Books; and that He deſired it might be *ſo* underſtood, and not as any ſort of *Retractation* of any thing He had before written; And that, as to that *Part* of the ſaid *Paper*, which relates to his writing upon this Subject, it was not his Deſign to lay Himſelf under an abſolute Obligation not to write again, (which He judg'd, it would be criminal and diſhoneſt to do) but only to expreſs his *Intention* (as He had done before this, in his laſt Book,) not to write any more on this Subject, unleſs ſome new, and juſtifiable Occaſion, ſhould make it a Point of Conſcience, and Honeſty ſo to do. This *ſecond Paper* I am inform'd, He conveyed to the *Biſhop* of *London* His Dioceſan; who very readily received it. *After* this, the Biſhops preſently came to the following Reſolution.

The

The Biſhops RESOLUTION *July* 5th, 1714, *upon the Delivery of the foregoing Paper.*

WE having received a Paper ſubſcribed by Dr *Clarke*, containing a Declaration of his Opinion concerning the Eternity of the Son and Holy Spirit, together with an Account of his Conduct for the time paſt, and Intentions for the time to come; which Paper we have ordered to be entred in the Acts of this Houſe, and to be communicated to the Lower-Houſe, do think fit to proceed no farther upon the Extract laid before us by the Lower-Houſe.

The

THis Resolution, together with Dr *Clarke's Paper*, being communicated to the *Lower-House*, and read in it, They came to this Determination, That Dr *Clarke* having NOT RETRACTED any of his Opinions which gave occasion to their first Complaint, They could not esteem His Paper *Satisfactory*.

They expected, it appears, an immediate and plain *Recantation*. But finding *nothing* of this in the Paper; nor so much as any absolute, or *binding Promise* not to write upon the same Subject; They did not think fit to accept as Satisfactory, all that the Dr thought consistent with his Honour and Conscience to offer them; or to agree with

with the *Bishops*, who, not out of any want of *Zeal*, (as appears from their *first Answer*) but, without doubt, from a further consideration of the Merits of the Cause, were willing to acquiesce in the Declaration he made of his Regard for the Peace of the *Church*, express'd in as ample Words, most People think, as any *Honest Man* in his Circumstances could possibly consent to make use of.

One Thing more I shall mention, because I have heard it frequently affirm'd by his *Friends* in Conversation, *viz.* that no Person is less attach'd to his own Opinions; or more truly dispos'd to hear what can be oppos'd to them, than *He* is; and that He is very willing and ready, to enter into the most *serious Debates*, both for his own Instruction, and for the further settling of so important a *Subject*, with any such of his *Brethren*, as may be deputed

deputed, for that Purpoſe, by that *Reverend Body* who are ſtill offended at Him; (if they ſhall think Him worthy of ſuch an Honour;) or with any other Learned Perſons: Though, they think, He ought to except ſuch as publiſh *Advertiſements* about *Conferences* which never were, and *Triumphs* which never exiſted, but in *Imagination.*

FINIS.